DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 120 UD 018 819

TITLE The CETA Program in Des Moines.
INSTITUTION Iowa State Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Des Moines.
PUB DATE Jun 78
NOTE 50p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Involvement; Economically Disadvantaged; Employment Opportunities; *Employment Programs; Federal Programs; *Females; *Job Training; *Minority Groups; Program Administration; *Program Evaluation; State Federal Aid; Unemployment
IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Employment Training Act; *Iowa (Des Moines)

ABSTRACT

The Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) program in Des Moines, Iowa, is analyzed in this report in light of its value for minorities, the economically disadvantaged, and people with little formal education. The history, purpose, organization, and administration of the program are outlined. Eligibility requirements for and availability of CETA training and job opportunities to women and minorities are discussed. Problems of Federal and local support, program administration, and community involvement are detailed. Fourteen charts included in the report substantiate the findings that further equal opportunity must be provided through the program for poorly educated minorities and women. (WI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

NOV 1 3 1978

The CETA Program in Des Moines

June 1978

ED163120

DO NOT RELEASE UNTIL
JUN 28 1978

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD018819

—A report of the Iowa Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights prepared for the information and consideration of the Commission. This report will be considered by the Commission, and the Commission will make public its reaction. In the meantime, the recommendations in this report should not be attributed to the Commission, but only to the Iowa Advisory Committee.

The CETA Program in Des Moines

—A report prepared by the Iowa Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights its recommendations to the President and the Congress.

Attribution:

The findings and recommendations contained in this report are those of the Iowa Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights and, as such, are not attributable to the Commission. This report has been prepared by the State Advisory Committee for submission to the Commission, and will be considered by the Commission in formulating

Right of Response:

Prior to the publication of a report, the State Advisory Committee affords to all individuals or organizations that may be defamed, degraded, or incriminated by any material contained in the report an opportunity to respond in writing to such material. All responses have been incorporated, appended, or otherwise reflected in the publication.

CUDO 18819

Letter of Transmittal

Iowa Advisory Committee to the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
June 1978

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION
Arthur S. Flemming, *Chairman*
Stephen Horn, *Vice Chairman*
Frankie Freeman
Manuel Ruiz, Jr.
Murray Saltzman

Louis B. Nuñez, *Acting Staff Director*

Sirs and Madam:

The Iowa Advisory Committee submits this report of its investigation of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act program in central Iowa as part of its responsibility to advise the Commission about civil rights problems within the State.

During our 12-month investigation, we examined the operation of the CETA program administered by the Central Iowa Regional Association of Local Governments on behalf of the city of Des Moines and the counties of Boone, Dallas, Jasper, Madison, Marion, Polk, Story, and Warren. We reviewed the operation of the Title I training program for adults, the Titles II and VI public service employment programs, and their administration in the city of Des Moines.

The Advisory Committee found that the hard-core unemployed are the principal target of the CETA program although other unemployed and underemployed persons are also eligible. Minorities and women are disproportionately concentrated in the ranks of the hard-core unemployed.

The Advisory Committee found that data on the economically disadvantaged, particularly minorities and women, are not reliable. The Committee recommends that the U.S. Department of Labor provide funds to CIRALG so that it can assemble its own data base on the target population.

The Advisory Committee found that CIRALG did not make a maximum effort to place in its Title I training program those applicants in greatest need. The Advisory Committee makes recommendations to CIRALG and the U.S. Department of Laobr for changes in the admissions procedure and selection criteria to increase service to those in greatest need.

The Advisory Committee found that the CIRALG program and CETA are not designed to train persons who have little formal education, although these (especially minorities) are a substantial portion of the economically disadvantaged. Minorities are not equally represented in all training classes. The Advisory Committee recommends changes that further equal opportunity through the program for poorly educated minorities and women.

The Advisory Committee found that the on-the-job training opportunities have not been fully utilized both because subcontractors have failed to find candidates and because employers have failed to provide jobs. The Advisory Committee makes recommendations to both CIRALG and the business community for improvement of this program.

The Advisory Committee found that admission to the training program took longer than necessary and that tests used may not be appropriate counseling tools to predict performance. The Advisory Committee recommends that CIRALG not use testing to control entry into training programs until tests are developed that can appropriately predict the student's receptivity to training irrespective of race, sex, or socioeconomic status.

The Advisory Committee found that CIRALG took few measures to attract disadvantaged minorities to the program. It recommends a significant increase in efforts to recruit these persons.

The Advisory Committee found that until April 1977 the public service employment program had utilized primarily white participants and agencies. It recommends increased funding of positions with minority nonprofit agencies as a means to increase the share of minorities and women in the more attractive jobs.

The Advisory Committee found that persons who need CETA programs frequently also need extensive support services such as health care and day care. These are provided in other programs in the region, but not in CIRALG's program. The Advisory Committee recommends that CIRALG should ensure that participants are getting sufficient support services through a stronger counseling program.

The Advisory Committee found that no minorities and few women are appointed representatives to the CIRALG association. Minorities and women have minimal involvement in the ultimate decisions about CETA. The Committee recommends that local governments take measures to provide minority and female representation in their appointments to the CIRALG association.

We urge you to concur with our recommendations and to assist the Advisory Committee in followup activities.

Respectfully,

PEG ANDERSON, Chairperson
Iowa Advisory Committee

Membership

Iowa Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights

Peg Anderson, Chairperson
Cedar Falls

John Estes, Chairperson
Des Moines Subcommittee
Des Moines

Harold E. Butz
Des Moines

Allen J. Correll
Des Moines

John M. Ely, Jr.
Cedar Rapids

Signi Falk
Cedar Rapids

Lee B. Furgerson
Des Moines

William E. Gluba
Davenport

Louise H. Goldman
Davenport

Carol A. Kramer
Newton

Naomi S. Mercer
Des Moines

Stephanie L. Michael
Des Moines

Irene Munoz
Muscatine

Paula S. Schaedlich
Ames

Joanne D. Soper
Sioux City

Robert A. Wright
Des Moines

Mose Waldinger
Des Moines

THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The United States Commission on Civil Rights, created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, is an independent, bipartisan agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government. By the terms of the act, as amended, the Commission is charged with the following duties pertaining to denials of the equal protection of the laws based on race, color, sex, religion, or national origin, or in the administration of justice: investigation of individual discriminatory denials of the right to vote; study of legal developments with respect to denials of equal protection of the law; appraisal of the laws and policies of the United States with respect to denials of equal protection of the law; maintenance of a national clearinghouse for information respecting denials of equal protection of the law; and investigation of patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination in the conduct of Federal elections. The Commission is also required to submit reports to the President and the Congress at such times as the Commission, the Congress, or the President shall deem desirable.

THE STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

An Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights has been established in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 as amended. The Advisory Committees are made up of responsible persons who serve without compensation. Their functions under their mandate from the Commission are to: advise the Commission on all relevant information concerning their respective States on matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission; advise the Commission on matters of mutual concern in the preparation of reports of the Commission to the President and the Congress; receive reports, suggestions, and recommendations from individuals, public and private organizations, and public officials upon matters pertinent to inquiries conducted by the State Advisory Commitee; initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission upon matters in which the Commission shall request the assistance of the State Advisory Committee; and attend, as observers, any open hearing or conference which the Commission may hold within the State.

Contents

1. **Introduction** 1
   - Background to the Advisory Committee Study
   - The Nation's Unemployment Problem
   - Federal Response to Unemployment—The CETA Program
   - Des Moines and the Advent of CETA
2. **The CETA Program in Des Moines** 7
   - The Population
   - Organization of the Program
   - Role of the City of Des Moines
3. **CETA Training and Its Availability to Minorities and Women** 11
   - Access to Classroom Training
   - Access to On-the-Job Training (OJT)
   - Access to Other Training or Work Experience
4. **Getting into the CETA Title I Training Program** 13
   - Eligibility
   - The Application Process
   - Classroom Entry Requirements
   - From Street to Door: The Problem of Recruitment
5. **Job Opportunities for Minorities and Women: Public Service Employment Program (PSE)** 19
   - Utilization by Minority Nonprofit Agencies
   - Hiring and Utilization of Minorities and Women in PSE Jobs
   - Transition from Federally-Funded Jobs to Unsubsidized Employment
6. **The "Creaming" Dilemma** 23
   - Creaming in Title I
   - Creaming in Public Service Employment
7. **Problems in the Administration of the CETA Program** 27
8. **The Community's Involvement in the CETA Program and Its Administration** 33
   - Manpower Area Planning Council
   - CIRALG Board
   - City of Des Moines
   - Minority and Female Staff Participation
9. **Summary and Conclusions** 37
10. **Findings and Recommendations** 39

Tables

1.1—Unemployment Rates, 1956 and 1977 2
2.1—CETA/CIRALG Participation Rate and Population Characteristics ... 8
2.2—The Education of Participants in CIRALG's Programs by Comparison with Their Share of the Population and Economically Disadvantaged 8
2.3—Proportion of Participants in CETA Titles I, II, and VI Who Are Economically Disadvantaged by Comparison to Their Share of the Population and Economically Disadvantaged 9
2.4—A Comparison of the Ethnic Characteristics of Enrollees with the Characteristics of the Population and the Economically Disadvantaged 9
3.1—Classroom Training Programs Provided by CIRALG during FY 1977 and FY 1978 11
4.1—Points Assigned by CIRALG to Determine Priority of Applicants 14
4.2—Minimum Skill Requirement for CIRALG Training Programs (in Grade Levels) as Measured by the California Test (FY 1977) or BOLT (FY 1978) 16
5.1—Proportions of Minorities and Women Hired under the Public Service Employment Program in Either Professional or Semiprofessional Positions by CIRALG and its Subcontractors, Nonprofit Agencies, and Governmental Units in the Des Moines SMSA 21
5.2—City of Des Moines, Transitions to City or Private Employment as a Proportion of Terminations (Percentage of Ethnic Group in Category) 22
6.1—Prior Income (Hourly Wage) of CETA Participants as a Proportion of Clients (FY 1977) 24
7.1—Performance in CETA 28
7.2—Percentage of Goal Accomplished in Adult Title I by Job Service and Greater Opportunities (Percentage of Expected Achievement to March 31, 1977) 31
Chart 1.1—Summary of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act .. 4

Appendices

A. CETA Program Characteristics, Federal Region VII 41
B. Calculation of Adult Educational Competence 43
Glossary 44

1. Introduction

Background to the Advisory Committee Study

On February 11, 1977, the newly rechartered Iowa Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights held its first meeting. Noting that the Committee previously had conducted no studies in the Des Moines area, members voted unanimously to look at the practices which may have the effect of excluding minorities and women from participating in the area's economic benefits to the same degree as whites. Land use patterns, geographical distribution of economic development, and employment training-placement programs were suggested for study. Ultimately, employment training-placement programs in Des Moines were selected as a starting point, as these affect more people directly and have a clearly defined scope through the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (CETA).[1]

A Des Moines subcommittee was established; it met five times to monitor progress, analyze information, and redirect staff efforts. The full Committee conducted a factfinding meeting on June 15–16, 1977, in which various facets of CETA programs were presented by persons knowledgeable about them, including the CETA prime sponsor, CETA subcontractors, city officials, community leaders, and CETA program participants. Subsequent to the June meeting, Advisory Committee staff obtained additional information from the prime sponsor, the Central Iowa Regional Association of Local Governments (CIRALG). In November a draft of this report was circulated to 64 participants in the project for their review and comments. This final report is based upon the transcript of the June meeting, data gathered from interviews prior to and after that factfinding meeting, information assembled from records of CIRALG, the U.S. Department of Labor, the Iowa Job Service, and the City of Des Moines, and from the comments received from respondents to the November 1977 draft report.

The Nation's Unemployment Problem

Unemployment and underemployment, and the resultant poverty that accompanies them, affect a higher proportion of minorities and women than white males. For decades in America, minorities and the women of all races have received annual incomes that average about 60 percent of what this country's white males receive. Unemployment rates for minority males consistently are at least twice as high as those of white males; currently the figures are 10.3 percent and 4.3 percent, respectively. The rate for all women is 7.1 percent; for minority women, 12.5 percent.[2]

Periods of economic decline are particularly harsh on minorities. Lester Thurow of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology reported that "two black men or women are thrown out of work for every white man or woman during a period of rising unemployment." While minorities made some headway in the 1960s, few gains have been registered since 1970. Unemployment rates for white women have actually risen since 1970.[3]

Writing in *The Economist,* Professor Thurow points out that blacks and women suffer disproportionately from unemployment, as table 1.1 shows.

[1] Dr. Phillip Langerman, chairperson of the manpower area planning council, comments: "It seemed to us that you started on the premise that we are discriminatory with regard to minorities and women, and that in fact you did not find this to be the case, although you still attempted to conclude that in some way." [Dr. Phillip Langerman, letter to Peg Anderson, Chairperson, Iowa Advisory Committee, Dec. 16, 1977.]
It is the duty of the Advisory Committee to investigate the opportunities available to minorities and women in Federal program efforts. But the Advisory Committee did not start with the premise that CIRALG's program discriminated. It did start with a question whether or not minorities and women are benefiting to the same degree as white males from the general prosperity in the Des Moines area and a belief that, nationwide, CETA programs are not involving women and minorities to the same degree as previous Federal job programs.

[2] U.S., Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *The Employment Situation—November 1977* (Dec. 2, 1977).

[3] Lester C. Thurow, "The Economic Status of Minorities and Women," *Civil Rights Digest,* vol. 8 (1976), no. 2–3 (Winter-Spring), pp. 2–7.

TABLE 1.1

Unemployment Rates, 1956 and 1977

	1956	1977
White males 25–55	2.6%	3.7%
White teenagers	10.1	15.0
White adult women	3.7	6.2
Black teenagers	18.2	39.5
Black adults	7.5	11.1

Adapted from *The Economist*, Dec. 24, 1977.

Unequal employment opportunities, especially for teenagers, will keep blacks and women from acquiring the on-the-job training that is the key to movement from entry-level to skilled positions. White males who provide the informal training will continue to train other white males. In the absence of full employment, minorities and women are doomed to replace one another in entry-level jobs without any opportunity for advancement.[4]

Recent data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics illustrate the problem for minorities.

> In 1976, as in previous years, the proportion of black men who worked during the year was substantially lower than that of white men—72 vs. 82 percent. Even among those who held jobs, black men were less likely to have worked all year than were white men.
>
> Hispanic men were about as likely to work at some time during the year as were white men, but, like black men, were much less likely to work all year at full-time jobs. This reflects, in part, the heavy concentration of these two groups in nonfarm labor, operative and service occupations where year-round full-time work is generally not as prevalent as in other fields of work. However, even in professional and managerial occupations, where year-round full-time work is most prevalent, smaller proportions of black and Hispanic men than of white men worked all year full time.[5]

According to Professor Bernard Anderson of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, the available data understate minority unemployment. The minority unemployment rate, he says, is eight times that of white males[6] (or 35 percent).

The U.S. Department of Labor has pointed out that it would require $7 billion devoted entirely to new jobs to produce a 1 percent reduction in the unemployment rate.[7] Yet the entire expenditure on CETA nationwide during FY 1977 (October 1976-September 1977) was budgeted at only $10.1 billion, of which only $7.2 billion went for new jobs.[8]

Federal Response to Unemployment—The CETA Program

Federal interest in employment and training is longstanding. The present programs succeed a series of earlier programs from the 1960s. The latter had a dual purpose: (a) to help the economically disadvantaged (the 1961 Area Redevelopment Act, the 1962 Manpower Development and Training Act, and the Equal Opportunity Act) and (b) to address temporary mass unemployment caused by recession (the Emergency Employment Act of 1971). The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 merged these two goals, the 17 programs, and 10,000 separate projects into a single framework. It also addressed the problem of underemployment.

CETA was the first piece of the "New Federalism" effort to reduce Federal "red tape" by restoring maximum authority to States and localities. CETA made block grants available by formula to be spent as local administrators thought best.

[4] Lester C. Thurow, "Inequality, Inflation and Growth in the American Economy," *The Economist*, vol. 265 (Dec. 24, 1977), pp. 31-32.
[5] U.S., Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Work Experience of Population in 1976*, Special Labor Force Report 201 (1977), p. 1.
[6] Bernard E. Anderson, "Full Employment and Economic Equality," *Civil Rights Digest*, vol. 8 (1976), no. 2-3 (Winter-Spring), pp. 22-25.
[7] U.S., General Accounting Office, *More Benefits to Jobless Can Be Attained in Public Service Employment*, HRD-77-53 (Apr. 7, 1977), p. 7.
[8] U.S., Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, *OPR and CETA Desk Review* (Sept. 22, 1977).

Chart 1.1 summarizes the provisions of the CETA legislation. Of greatest interest to the Advisory Committee are the revised training programs authorized under Title I; public service employment programs under Title II (for areas with substantial unemployment, 6.5 percent or more); and Title VI (the Emergency Jobs and Unemployment Assistance Act of 1974), which also creates public service jobs.[9]

Under the new program, CETA programs can be sponsored by any unit of government having more than 100,000 people or by the State (for those areas that would not otherwise be served). There were, in 1974, 497 such jurisdictions. Of these, 224 (45 percent) combined to form multidistrict consortia, which included 64 percent of all eligible cities and 40 percent of all eligible counties. They did this to obtain a bonus of 10 percent offered by the Federal Government to promote joint regional and metropolitan approaches to jobs and employment.[10] Some rural areas that had comprehensive employment programs (CEP) prior to 1974 are allowed to become program operators under CETA although not otherwise eligible, as are some jurisdictions which could persuade the Secretary of Labor that their operation of a CETA program would best serve the public interest.

In FY 1978 there are 450 prime sponsors—180 counties, 73 cities, 142 consortia, 51 balance-of-State programs, and the rest are former rural comprehensive employment programs.

These prime sponsors are required to design a comprehensive strategy to meet the area's need for employment and training. They are given broad guidelines as to eligible activities, subject to only limited review by the U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration. However, the prime sponsors are required to assure DOL that key segments of the population (women, minorities, veterans, and the economically disadvantaged) will be included in the programs. They also have to assure compliance with the nondiscrimination requirements in Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, as amended.

In the design of a program and its implementation, prime sponsors must establish a manpower area planning council, including representatives of client groups, community-based organizations, employment service, education and training agencies and institutions, business, and labor,[11] so that all concerned with employment problems, including the unemployed, can take part in local decisionmaking.

Des Moines and the Advent of CETA

Prior to CETA, four community action agencies in the CIRALG area ran employment and training programs. The largest was the concentrated employment program run by the city of Des Moines, which had as subcontractors Iowa Job Service, the local community action agency (Greater Opportunities, Inc.), and the Des Moines Skills Center. Greater Opportunities also ran two programs, Neighborhood Youth Corps and Operation Mainstream, for Des Moines and the five-county area around it. On December 3, 1973, by roll call number 5611 the Des Moines City Council, at the request of CIRALG, agreed to allow CIRALG to become "prime sponsor" of these programs. The Des Moines Area Planning Council had unanimously recommended the designation of CIRALG as the prime sponsor. Such a designation would allow local elected officials control over the program.[12] Shortly thereafter these and similar programs were absorbed into CETA legislation. CIRALG began operating a CETA program in June 1974. Statewide programs included the public employment program and on-the-job training programs run by Iowa Job Service. CIRALG did have responsibility for area employment and training planning starting in September 1973 when the city's employment planning unit was shifted to CIRALG. This provided planning for Des Moines and the area including Boone, Dallas, Jasper, Madison, Marion, Polk, Story, and Warren Counties.

When CETA replaced the previous categorical grant programs, the city of Des Moines, the area's only jurisdiction with more than 100,000 people, found itself with several choices. As the only jurisdiction eligible to be a prime sponsor, the city could have opted to run a program for the city of Des Moines alone. In that case it is probable that the remainder of the CIRALG area would have been in a program administered by the State. Des Moines

[9] Mirengoff and Rindler state that only 56 percent of Federal employment and training funds are channeled through CETA. The remainder are in other programs, e.g., Emergency Public Works Acts, Employment Service Administration. W. Mirengoff and L. Rindler, *The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act . . .* (National Academy of Sciences: 1976), p. 21.

[10] Ibid., p. 29.

[11] Ibid., p. 53.

[12] Richard Wilkey, city manager, letter to the Des Moines City Council (No. 129), Dec. 3, 1973.

CHART 1.1

Summary of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (Public Law 93–203, as amended) has seven titles:

Title I establishes a program of financial assistance to State and local governments (prime sponsors) for comprehensive manpower services. Prime sponsors are cities and counties of 100,000 or more, and consortia, defined as any combination of government units in which one member has a population of 100,000 or more. A State may be a prime sponsor for areas not covered by local governments.

The prime sponsor must submit a comprehensive plan acceptable to the Secretary of Labor. The plan must set forth the kinds of programs and services to be offered and give assurances that manpower services will be provided to unemployed, underemployed, and disadvantaged persons most in need of help.

The sponsor must also set up a planning council representing local interests to serve in an advisory capacity.

The mix and design of services is to be determined by the sponsor, who may continue to fund programs of demonstrated effectiveness or set up new ones.

Eighty percent of the funds authorized under this title are apportioned in accordance with a formula based on previous levels of funding, unemployment, and low income. The 20 percent not under the formula are to be distributed as follows: 5 percent for special grants for vocational education, 4 percent for State manpower services, and 5 percent to encourage consortia. The remaining amount is available at the Secretary's discretion.

State governments must establish a State manpower service council to review the plans of prime sponsors and make recommendations for coordination and for the cooperation of State agencies.

Title II provides funds to hire unemployed and underemployed persons in public service jobs in areas of substantial unemployment. *Title III* provides for direct Federal supervision of manpower programs for Indians, migrant and seasonal farm workers, and special groups, such as youth, offenders, older workers, persons of limited English-speaking ability, and other disadvantaged. This title also gives the Secretary the responsibility for research, evaluation, experimental and demonstration projects, labor market information, and job-bank programs. *Title IV* continues the Job Corps. *Title V* establishes a National Manpower Commission. *Title VI*, added in December 1974 under the Emergency Jobs and Unemployment Assistance Act, authorizes a 1-year appropriation of $2.5 billion for a public service employment program for all areas, not just for areas of substantial unemployment. *Title VII* contains provisions applicable to all programs, such as prohibitions against discrimination and political activity.

would get 90 percent of the preceding year's funding. Instead, the city of Des Moines opted to join a CETA consortium administered by CIRALG, consisting of eight counties in Central Iowa surrounding Des Moines. This would result in the city's retaining 99 percent of its previous year's funding during FY 1975.[13] This arrangement also pleased the other jurisdictions, which tended to prefer participation through CIRALG as opposed to direct State administration. Through Title II and later through Title VI (the public service employment program), some of the local governments comprising the consortium became involved in the hiring of the unemployed on a temporary basis, subject to a formula that set the number of positions to which each jurisdiction was entitled.

[13] Richard Wilkey, letter to the Des Moines City Council (No. 271), Feb. 28, 1974.

2. The CETA Program in Des Moines

The Population

The population of the eight-county CIRALG area was 502,206 in 1970, of whom 313,533 lived in the two-county Des Moines SMSA, which contains 71 percent of the unemployed persons in CIRALG's area. In 1976 unemployment in the SMSA among white males was 4.1 percent; among black males it was 9.4 percent; among white females, 4.5 percent; and among black females, 8.2 percent. Hispanic unemployment rates were 4.9 percent for males and 8.9 percent for females. The Iowa Department of Job Service reports that about one-quarter of the minority and one-sixth of the female jobseekers needed additional training if they were to get jobs in their fields of interest.[1]

Tables 2.1–2.4, show the participation rates, population characteristics, and the target goals of the CETA program. Table 2.1 shows that while males were less than half of the population and less than one-quarter of the disadvantaged, there were no targets for planned enrollment. But males constituted well over half of the actual enrollees. By contrast, women comprised more than half of the population and over three-quarters of the economically disadvantaged. There were no targets for women for FY 1977, and they were to be 24.2 percent of the enrollees in FY 1978 (45.2 percent of Title I). In fact, planned enrollment of women for FY 1978 was less than the number of those actually enrolled in FY 1977.

Table 2.2 shows that those with less than a 12th grade education were 34.6 percent of the population and 49 percent of the economically disadvantaged. The program planned that 7.9 percent of its enrollees in FY 1977 and 20.2 percent in FY 1978 would not have 12 years of schooling. In fact, during FY 1977, 36.8 percent of those enrolled had less than 12 years of schooling.

Table 2.3 shows that 3.6 percent of the CIRALG area's population received public assistance. But 92 percent of the economically disadvantaged received aid to families with dependent children (AFDC).

CIRALG planned that public assistance recipients would be 8.2 percent of those served in FY 1977 and 23.1 percent of those it would serve in FY 1978. In fact, 17.5 percent of those served in FY 1977 were on AFDC and 5.4 percent received some other public assistance.

Table 2.3 shows that 7 percent of the population were economically disadvantaged. CIRALG planned that the economically disadvantaged would be 55.5 percent of those served in FY 1977 and 20.5 percent of those served in FY 1978. During FY 1977, 73.3 percent of those served were economically disadvantaged.

Table 2.4 shows that 94.8 percent of the CIRALG area population in 1970 was white. But 16 percent of the economically disadvantaged in the population were nonwhite; 2 percent were Hispanic. CIRALG planned that nonwhites would be 8.3 percent of those served in FY 1977 and 15.8 percent of those served in FY 1978. The nonwhite share of planned enrollment in FY 1978 is less than their 23 percent share of clients actually enrolled in FY 1977.

---

[1] Iowa Department of Job Service, *Manpower Information for Affirmative Action Programs—1977—Des Moines*, SMSA (nd, np).
The following table shows the national and local seasonally adjusted unemployment rates for the Nation and Des Moines in the years 1974–76:

	1974	1975	1976
National [a]	5.6	8.5	7.7
Des Moines [a]	3.1	4.4	4.3
CIRALG [b]	MD	5.2 *	3.8 *

* Data not adjusted
MD = missing data

Sources:
[a] Bureau of Labor Statistics
[b] Job Service of Iowa

It is clear that at no time did the recession have the kind of marked effect on the Des Moines area that it had on the Nation as a whole. The absence of data for the CIRALG area for 1974 makes similar comparison for it impossible.

TABLE 2.1

CETA–CIRALG, Participation Rates and Population Characteristics

		CETA PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS [2]						
	1970 [1] Census	Title I	Title II	Title VI	Total	Econo.[3] disadv.	Planned [4] to serve FY 77–78	
Number of persons	502,206	2,053	271	714	3,038	N/A		
Sex (percent)								
Male	48.6	54.1	53.9	52.5	53.7	24	—	—*
Female	51.4	45.9	46.1	47.5	46.3	76	—	24.2

* No goals were set for Titles II and VI.

Sources:
1. Job Service of Iowa.
2. CIRALG 4th Quarter Summary of Client Characteristics.
3. CIRALG FY 1978 program planning data.
4. CIRALG FY 1977, FY 1978 revised program planning summaries.

TABLE 2.2

The Education of Participants in CIRALG's Programs by Comparison with Their Share of the Population and Economically Disadvantaged

		CETA PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS						
Education	Census 1970	Title I	Title II	Title VI	Total	Econo.* disadv.	Planned to serve	
8 and under	19.5%	13.3%	1.8%	2.4%	9.7%	3%	FY 77	FY 78
9–11	15.1	34.3	31.1	12.3	27.1	46	7.9%	20.2%
High school graduate or equivalent	40.3	44.4	42.8	44.1	44.2	44	—	—
Post high school	25.1	8.0	44.3	41.2	19.0	7	—	—

* In this column the categories are grades 0–7, 8–11, 12th, over 12. These are the best estimates available for these categories.
Sources: CIRALG, Bureau of the Census, and program planning summaries.

Organization of the Program

Central Iowa Regional Association of Local Goverments (CIRALG) is a State-chartered association composed of local governments in the eight counties of central Iowa to provide common services and coordination on such matters as general planning, A-95 review, water and waste management, transportation, housing planning, open spaces, recreation, and programs for the aging, as well as employment and training. It is governed by a board that includes representatives of its member local governments. CIRALG has a staff of 61, 23 of whom work on the CETA program. Until June 1976 J. Terry Smith was CIRALG's executive director. In August 1976 he was succeeded by Dennis Harney. While the manager of the CETA program is the operations director, the executive director has always maintained close direct supervision of it.[5]

[5] Robert Krebsbach, interview in Des Moines, Apr. 20, 1977, and Dennis Harney, interview in Des Moines, May 19, 1977.

TABLE 2.3

Proportion of Participants in CETA Titles I, II, and VI Who Are Economically Disadvantaged by Comparison to Their Share of the Population and Economically Disadvantaged

CETA PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Income	1970 Census	Title I	Title II	Title VI	Total	Econo.* disadv.	Planned to Serve FY 77	Planned to Serve FY 78
AFDC	3.6%	20.7%	4.4%	13.4%	17.5%	92	8.2%	23.1%
Public assistance other		6.4	0.7	4.3	5.4	MD		
Economically disadvantaged	7.0	77.3	41.7	73.9	73.3	—	55.5	20.5*
Unemployed/UI claimant	2.7**	4.6	15.5	13.3	7.6	17	5.1	12.4

* No target was set for Title I.
** Unemployed.
MD = missing data.
Sources: CIRALG and Iowa Job Service, Bureau of the Census, and program planning summaries.

TABLE 2.4

A Comparison of the Ethnic Characteristics of Enrollees with the Characteristics of the Population and the Economically Disadvantaged

CETA PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Ethnic Group	1970 Census	Title I	Title II	Title VI	Total	Econo. Disadv.	Planned to Serve FY 77	Planned to Serve FY 78
White	94.8%	79.2%	72.0%	72.4%	77.0%	83%		
Black	2.5	13.4	22.9	22.5	16.4	15		
American Indian	0.1	0.6	1.8	2.9	1.3	0	8.3%	15.8%
Other/Oriental	0.4	6.7	3.3	2.1	5.3	1		
Spanish American	0.9	3.8	1.8	1.4	3.1	2	—	—
Limited English speaking ability	—	4.0	0.7	0.4	2.9	—	—	—
Offender	—	8.6	3.3	5.9	7.5	—	—	—

Note: Census data does not total 100% because of roundings and efforts to eliminate double counting. There are overlaps in other columns.
Sources: CIRALG, Iowa Job Service, and program planning summaries.

The administration of CETA by CIRALG is divided. The operations unit, formally called the employability development section, originated in the city's concentrated employment program (CEP). When that program was transferred to CIRALG at the inception of CETA, CEP's key administrators

came with it, including Robert Krebsbach who became operations director. In the latter part of FY 1976 Mr. Krebsbach was replaced as operations director by Anthony Gales. CIRALG's 23-member CETA staff provides day-to-day program services.

Separate from the operations unit is a small group of planners and administrators. The planning unit headed by the senior employability planner became a recognizable force for employment and training planning. This planning unit reported independently to the associate director in FY 1977 and now reports to the director of human resources while maintaining some linkage with the operations unit. Planners have been accused by operations people of insensitivity to clients. Planners accuse operations of inept implementation of proposed reforms.[5]

A third element in the operation of the CETA program is the Manpower Area Planning Council of Central Iowa (MAPCCI). In FY 1977 it included representatives of the prime sponsor (CIRALG), local governments, the service subcontractors, labor, business, and the public. The council was chaired until September 1977 by Ernest Comito, a city labor leader. He was succeeded by Phillip Langerman, a Drake University dean. Prior to FY 1977 this group drafted the CETA plans. But in FY 1977 primary responsibility for planning was shifted to the planning unit, with MAPCCI serving in a strictly advisory capacity. MAPCCI members have protested this change.[6]

CETA program services that CIRALG has subcontracted include outreach, intake, assessment, placement, training, and support. Prior to FY 1977, Greater Opportunities, Inc., a Des Moines community action agency, held the subcontract to provide outreach, intake, assessment, and placement in the eight-county area. In FY 1977 the city of Des Moines insisted it would not allow Greater Opportunities to provide these services. The council had received allegations of improprieties by top Greater Opportunities officials. Eventually the "manpower" unit of Greater Opportunities was allowed to continue servicing the area outside Polk County. Job Service of Iowa obtained the contract within Polk County and the city of Des Moines.[5] In FY 1978 Iowa Comprehensive Manpower Services was awarded the contract for the entire eight-county area.

Classroom training is provided by the Des Moines Area Community College. In FY 1977 classes were provided both at the college's Ankeny campus and at CIRALG's own facility on Bell Avenue. In FY 1978 CIRALG closed its Bell Avenue facilities and all classes were moved either to Ankeny or to locations in central Des Moines.

Additional outreach, intake, assessment, and placement services for drug offenders are provided by the Employment Assistance for Recovered Drug Abusers program of Alternatives for Drugs and Alcohol Preventive Treatment, Inc. (now called Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services, Inc.).

Job Service of Iowa, in addition to its generally available placement services, provides certification of unemployment, a requirement for CETA Title II and Title VI eligibility. CIRALG verifies the other requirements for eligibility.

Role of the City of Des Moines

By annual roll call vote, the Des Moines City Council approves the employment and training plan that CIRALG submits to the U.S. Department of Labor to receive money for employment and training. The city council can make recommendations to revise the plan as needed and can withhold approval. The city has exercised this prerogative sparingly in the past.[6] The city can unilaterally end the consortium by withdrawal.

Two members of the council, Russell LaVine and Timothy Urban, told Advisory Committee staff that they knew only the broad outline of the CETA program. Council member Archie Brooks, a city representative on the CIRALG board, stated that "if you ask the other councilmen what the CETA program is all about, they could not tell you."[7] When interviewed, Mayor Richard Olson appeared to rely upon his alternate on the CIRALG board, city clerk Helen Barlow, for information related to CETA.[8]

[5] Staff interview notes, Des Moines, Iowa, May 19, 1977.
[6] Don Rowen, interview in Des Moines, May 18, 1977.
[6] "Council Eases Stand on Jobs Plan Contract," *Des Moines Tribune*, Sept. 14, 1976; and, "New Job Contract is Denied to GO," *Des Moines Tribune*, Aug. 26, 1976.
[7] Archie Brooks, telephone interview, Dec. 13, 1977.
[7] Telephone interview, Dec. 13, 1977.
[8] Richard Olson, mayor, interview in Des Moines, May 18, 1977.

3. CETA Training and Its Availability to Minorities and Women

For those who never had any marketable skills, or for those whose skills have been made obsolete by changing technology, training provides access to employment. CIRALG's CETA program offers such opportunities. However, access to the training classes is limited in a variety of ways. The most significant barrier is the educational achievement required for admission to the programs.

The CETA program offers on-the-job training opportunities where appropriate. These, in theory, provide training by private sector employers who will retain the worker at full wage after training him or her at partial Federal expense (of those who completed the OJT program, 79.5 percent obtained employment).

One measure of the success of Title I efforts is the proportion of trainees who obtained jobs following the training (38.8 percent).

Access to Classroom Training

During both FY 1977 and FY 1978 there has been a mix of "class-size training," in which whole classrooms were devoted to CETA clients, and "slot-in training," under which CIRALG bought space for individual students at public or private colleges, universities, and training institutions.

Table 3.1 shows the class-size training offered by CIRALG during FY 1977 when 159 students were to be enrolled and FY 1978 when the number was reduced to 110.

The Advisory Committee did not review slot-in training that is provided for persons wanting classes in vocations not a part of CIRALG's classroom program. Carroll Bennett, dean of career education at the community college, pointed out that substantial use of slot-in would place CETA trainees on campuses where support services were insufficient

TABLE 3.1

Classroom Training Programs Provided BY CIRALG During FY 1977 and FY 1978

Program	FY 1977	FY 1978
Auto body*	13	
Auto service mechanics*	13	
Building maintenance	12	15
Business occupations	61	50
Copy reproduction	10	10
Machine shop	13	20
Upholstery*	10	
Welding	27	15
TOTAL	159	110

* Training in these programs was eliminated in FY 1978.

Source: CIRALG.

for their needs (which he believed to be greater than those of the average community college student).[1]

In addition to vocational skills training, some clients need help with such basics as reading or mathematics. Prior to FY 1977 this was provided as part of the vocational training program in special adult basic education classes. During FY 1977 this training was available, but was not provided on a wholesale basis. During FY 1978 such training could be purchased for a client at an institution specializing in adult basic education.

Access to On-the-Job Training (OJT)

The principal alternate to in-class training is on-the-job training. Participants in this activity are found jobs in the private sector. The program can reimburse the employer for training expenses equal to half the participant's salary during a limited training period. Significant deficiencies in the OJT program have been noted. In FY 1977 only 77.2 percent of available slots had been filled. The prime sponsor reported that as of January 1977 each of Job Services' three job developers was producing only 1.33 jobs per month. CIRALG noted in a corrective action memo to Job Services that OJT was less interesting to the client because it guaranteed an allowance for a shorter period of time.[2] Ernest Comito, a city labor leader, said employers also were not enthusiastic. (Transcript, pp. 189–90)[3] In a memorandum to Job Services, CIRALG urged that OJT be utilized when desired training classes were full.[4]

Monroe Colston, urban affairs director for the Des Moines Chamber of Commerce, suggested placements in the on-the-job program could be increased were CIRALG to go to employers and say, "We want to do an assessment based upon your future needs, employer. Let us link up and do the training that will encompass what you are really looking for." He stated that, "I don't know if the staff has really. . .religiously tried to do that, and if they did, then it seems to me as though they would have had to start with me, and that process has not taken place." (Transcript, p. 203).

Access to Other Training or Work Experience

For training in health care and similar subjects, CIRALG provided funds to enable trainees to attend local institutions. Until FY 1977 the program attempted to place each applicant in some kind of temporary employment prior to involvement in a training program.

In FY 1977 CIRALG did not offer "work experience" in its adult program. This would have enabled it to provide transitional funding to clients while they waited for processing through intake and assessment. In addition to the money, experience in performing even a low-skill job can instill confidence, work habits, and improved motivation. While Job Service indicated an interest in providing a temporary employment component, none was ever implemented. A comparison between what CIRALG offered and what was provided by other programs in Federal Region VII (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska) can be seen in appendix A.

[1] Carroll Bennett, interview in Ankeny, Iowa, May 19, 1977.
[2] Jack Hatch, memorandum to Marc Sprenger, Jan. 28, 1977.
[3] References to the transcript of the factfinding hearing held by the Iowa Advisory Committee on June 15–16, 1977, in the Des Moines City Council Chambers are cited in the text of this report.
[4] Jack Hatch, memorandum to Marc Sprenger, Jan. 28, 1977.

4. Getting into the CETA Title I Training Program

For the discouraged worker who has faced a long period of unemployment or who has never held a steady job, rejection is the norm and failure the expectation. Thus, many disadvantaged workers when faced with the CETA application process see it as another technique for rejection. Many economically disadvantaged may never even hear of CETA or think it worthwhile to apply.

Persuading the disadvantaged to apply is the function of a sound recruitment program. Providing suitable training and ultimate placement in the private sector is the program operator's job.

Eligibility

Persons are eligible for CETA training if they are economically disadvantaged, unemployed, or underemployed. Persons are economically disadvantaged if they are members of a family receiving cash welfare payments, or whose total family income in relation to family size does not exceed poverty level ($5,850 for a family of 4) or 70 percent of the "lower living standard income level" ($7,030 for family of 4). Persons other than the head of household or spouse are considered independent even though they live "at home." An unemployed person is one who is without a job, wants work, and is available for work, or who is a "discouraged worker." A person is defined as being without a job if he or she did not work during the calendar week preceding the week in which determination of eligibility for participation is made. Persons are considered underemployed who are working part time but have been seeking full-time work or who are working full time and who are members of a family whose income relative to family size does not exceed poverty level. Such persons must also be residents of the prime sponsor area in which they make application.[1]

[1] 42 Fed. Reg. 55,729ff (1977). Actual income from U.S., Department of Labor, *Prime Sponsor Issuance(s)*, PSI71–77, 100–77.

The Application Process

Des Moines residents wishing to make application during FY 1977 had to go to 2600 Bell Avenue, the intake center for their area. A bus from downtown to Bell Avenue ran from a point about one-half mile east of the center of the black community to about one-quarter mile from the CIRALG intake facility. However, this route operated only in morning and afternoon rush hours. The last bus left the black community for Bell Avenue at 9:25 a.m. The first bus back left Bell Avenue at 2:47 p.m.[2]

Having arrived at the CETA center, the Polk County applicant might be subjected to a brush with the bureaucracy. CETA operations director Anthony Gales said:

> The bureaucracy will not permit you to push someone in and out within 5 or 10 minutes. Certainly there are people who come there already discouraged. They are discouraged because it is 90 degrees, and they had to wait on the street corner to get a ride, and then they may have to sit and wait for an hour and a half to get served, so by the time they get to see someone their whole attitude is, "The sun is against me; the bus system is against me. Nobody wants me, so the first persons I talk to, I am going to take it all out on them."
>
> Well, if I am a counselor and I am hassled because I have got a lot of paperwork, and an individual comes in and at that particular moment their attitude seems to be somewhat different, then that causes me to be somewhat different. The difference, though, is that I have the authority and the power to let someone in or keep them out, and sometimes it becomes subjective. (Transcript, pp. 309–10)

During the first ("intake") interview at the Bell Avenue center, an "intake worker" filled out an initial application and calculated the client's "points"

[2] Information derived from Des Moines Metropolitan Transit Authority line route schedule.

TABLE 4.1

Points Assigned by CIRALG to Determine Priority of Applicants

Eligibility Guidelines	Points	
Unemployed	10	
Economically disadvantaged	10	
Underemployed	6	
Nonwhite	7	
Head of household	8	Applicants could get points in only one of these categories.
Primary wage earner—for families	6	
Primary wage earner—for singles	5	
Public assistance recipient	5	
18–24 years of age	4	
25–44 years of age	3	
Handicapped or disabled	3	
Over 45 years of age	2	
Special—Vietnam veteran	2	
Other veterans	1	

Source: CIRALG.

under CIRALG's system for determining eligibility and priority for service. This point system is illustrated in table 4.1. After intake, the applicant was sent to a counselor for an indepth interview to determine interests and needs. If the client was headed for training, testing would be scheduled following the interview.

In theory, all this could be completed in a single day. But in January 1977, the prime sponsor observed to the Job Service of Iowa (the intake and assessment subcontractor for Polk County, including Des Moines) that it was taking as much as 2 months for clients with average point scores of 28–29 (out of a possible 49) to be called back for the counselor interview. (Even clients with the highest scores waited a week.)[3] Job Service eventually agreed to improve its performance, but as of March 1977 the average delay prior to the first counselor session remained at least 1 week.[4] After the scheduling and taking of tests, the client returned for a second interview with the counselor at which the client's employability development plan (EDP) was written. Once approved, this charted the client's course in the program. In theory, the entire process could be completed in 3 working days.[5] In practice it took anywhere from 1 week (for clients with high point scores) to a month or longer (for clients with average point scores).

The Advisory Committee sampled Polk County applicants in April 1977. A large proportion of Polk County applicants dropped out during the assessment process. Of white male applicants, 48.4 percent (62 out of 128) and of white female applicants, 41.7 percent (35 out of 84) dropped out prior to testing or the interviews that preceded or followed the test. A still higher proportion of black applicants dropped

[3] Jack Hatch, memorandum to Marc Sprenger, Jan. 28, 1977.

[4] In April 1977 the Advisory Committee's staff drew a sample of 299 applications by race and sex to be roughly proportionate to the applicant pool of the Polk County area, which contains most of the minority population in the CIRALG region and therefore results in overrepresentation of the minorities in the sample. These applicants' progress through assessment and the program was traced from counselor files provided by CIRALG.

Marc Sprenger of Job Service comments on the preliminary draft:

> This review uses much of the data through 3-31-77. At that point the methods of operation was [sic] six months old. It is doubtful in my mind that the use of production figures or the operational mode should be questioned based on that period. After all the only terminations you could have during that time frame are almost entirely negative ones, the eventual positives were still in training. [Marc Sprenger, letter to Melvin Jenkins, regional counsel, Central States Regional Office, Dec. 16, 1977]

Job Service became involved in the program in October 1977. The program predates Job Service—persons could have entered pre-October 1977 and completed training between October and March 1977—as in fact 153 persons did. CIRALG has noted that persons enrolled before October 1977 appeared more likely to finish training than those enrolled by Job Service. (Peter Raimondo, memorandum to Tony Gales, Apr. 5, 1977.) Given continuous entry into training, and training periods of 17–30 weeks, some completions by persons entering post-October 1977 from the welding and building maintenance programs (whose training period was only 17 weeks and which take about one-quarter of the trainees) could be expected. OJT completions and placements would also have been a significant component of indirect placement, since these lasted not more than 26 weeks (less for most jobs).

[5] Jack Hatch, memorandum to Marc Sprenger, Jan. 28, 1977.

out, 55.2 percent of males (16 out of 29) and 48.3 percent of females (14 out of 29). There were 29 others, 10 Hispanics and 19 Vietnamese. Of these, 38.1 percent dropped out during the evaluation process. Of all applicants, 68.2 percent (204 out of 299) did not proceed beyond intake-assessment.[6]

Poorly educated white males and females in Polk County were somewhat more likely to drop out than the better educated. (Fifty-two percent of males and 54 percent of females who dropped out had 11 years or less of schooling.) But black males and females who dropped out were more likely to have completed high school or acquired a GED than not. (Fifty-eight percent of males and 69 percent of females had a high school diploma or GED.) To evaluate applicants' need for training or employment, CIRALG used a point system that gave the most points to the economically disadvantaged, unemployed, handicapped, Vietnam veterans, heads of households, and nonwhites. White applicants who scored lowest were more likely to complete processing than those who scored higher (19.4 percent versus 13.9 percent). But black applicants with high scores were more likely to drop out than white applicants with high scores (66.7 percent versus 50 percent).[7]

During the first two quarters of FY 1977, the Advisory Committee's sample shows that 5.5 percent of white male applicants (seven persons) entered a training program, as did 9.5 percent of white females (eight persons). But only 3.5 percent of black males (one person) or black females (one person) entered the training program.[8]

Classroom Entry Requirements

Training programs are not open to everyone. The vocational training offered by CIRALG has clear minimum criteria. In 1977 these were based on nationally established norms using the General Aptitude Test Battery and the California test. (When the latter was determined to be invalid, the Basic Occupational Literacy Test was substituted.) The requirements are summarized in table 4.2.

Testing was routinely used by Job Service to assess applicants' fitness for entry into training programs. An appendix to the Job Service contract states that an indepth interview "should, in most cases, provide enough information about the applicant to identify a clear occupational goal which would enable the interviewer to make an Employability Development Plan (EDP) on the applicant as a result of this interview only." The work statement goes on to indicate that "if the interviewer does not feel that an EDP can be constructed on the basis of the information" obtained, tests might be ordered "to give a clear and realistic picture of the applicant's ability and aptitude in regard to a specific occupational goal. . . ."[9]

While the contract does not appear to require tests, Job Service told CIRALG that: "References to [the requirements for testing] in supervisory meetings as a screening imposed by Job Service enrollment criteria is an error. The community college has the testing criteria imposed to create a selection methodology." Job Service contended that "if the Prime Sponsor wants to eliminate the testing situation it would be necessary for them to work this out with the community college. . . ."[10] During this period, guidelines provided by the Des Moines Area Community College (DMACC) did specify that for admission to a program the applicant "Must score a minimum (not average of). . . ." varying grade levels on the California Test of Adult Basic Education. For FY 1978 similar requirements were set using the Basic Occupational Literacy Test (BOLT). In both years specific standards were set using the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB).[11]

The appropriateness of these tests is open to question. The BOLT test has not yet been reviewed in the professional literature. The Employment and Training Administration, sponsor of BOLT, reports that norms relating test scores to skills needed for vocational training have not yet been developed. Instead, BOLT scores have been equated to the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), Intermediate II tests. This test allows equation to GED levels for each job category.[12] However, as is pointed out in Buros' *Mental Measurement Yearbook*, "the SAT has not been shown to have validity for curriculum guidance. Yet guidance counselors constantly use

[6] Data from Advisory Committee sample study. The number of Hispanics sampled, 10, was too small for any valid study.
[7] Data from Advisory Committee sample study.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Adult and Youth Services Agreement between Central Iowa Regional Association of Local Governments and Job Service of Iowa (Sept. 27, 1976).
[10] Attachment to a memorandum from Tony Gales to MAPC, Apr. 22, 1977.
[11] Carl Rolf, DMACC contract supervisor, memorandum to Jim Underwood, Oct. 6, 1977, and Carl Rolf, memorandum to Tony Gales, Oct. 7, 1976.
[12] U.S., Department of Labor, *Manual for the USES Basic Occupational Literacy Test 1972*, Sec. 2, pp. 11–12.

TABLE 4.2

Minimum Skill Requirements for CIRALG Training Programs (in grade levels) As Measured by the California Test (FY 1977) or BOLT (FY 1978)

Program	CRITERIA (GRADE LEVEL) FY 1977			CRITERIA (GRADE LEVEL) FY 1978				
	Reading	Vocabulary	Math, reasoning, and computation	Reading comprehension	Arithmetic reasoning	Arithmetic computation	Spelling	Mechanics
	Grade levels				*Grade levels*			
Auto body	7	7	7	8	7	7	—	10
Auto mechanics	9	9	9	10	7	7	10	10
Building maintenance	9	9	9	9	7	7	9	9
Business occupations	9	9	9	10	10	8	8	8
Copy reproduction	9	9	9	8	7	7	—	—
Machine shop	9	9	9	9	9	9	—	—
Upholstery	7	7	7	—	—	—	—	—
Welding	7	9	9	7	7	7	—	—

Note: The standard is based on the accomplishments that could be expected of a person who had completed the grade specified in the table.
Source: CIRALG.

standardized achievement test scores among other predictors, in counseling students concerning the selection of courses. . . ."[13] If the Stanford test cannot be used to predict performance, the BOLT test whose norms are dependent on Stanford is similarly limited. Yet minimum capacity to complete training is what DMACC demands be tested.

But the appropriateness of GATB to determine the fitness of an applicant for training has been questioned in *The Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook*. The reporter states that the publisher "has presented no direct evidence to indicate that individuals with high scores on a given test can *learn* [original emphasis] to do any job better than individuals with low scores."[14]

While specific data on adult educational competence in Des Moines are unavailable, Des Moines school district test data show that somewhere between 16 and 26 percent of the Des Moines city population would score at lower than ninth grade on a test. For students from schools with substantial black enrollments, the comparable figures are as high as between 32 and 47 percent. National studies suggest as many as 40 percent of low-income persons cannot reach the minimum standards. An explanation of these figures is reviewed in appendix B.

In the Advisory Committee sample, 3.4 percent of the black males and 6.9 percent of the black females were rejected (as were 3.9 percent of white males and 3.6 percent of white females).[15]

The prime sponsor argued that minimum educational standards are essential. Anthony Gales, operations director, asserted that, "You can't take someone who can't read a manual and tell them to fix a car." (Transcript, p. 302) The vocational education subcontractor, Des Moines Area Community College, reported that some of the trainees sent to classes did not have the minimum skills specified in the class requirement guidelines and that this would raise the noncompletion rate. But DMACC staff agreed that, given sufficient resources, students with lower educational capacity could be served.[16]

Janet Zobel, of the National Urban League, cited to the Advisory Committee comments of Lucille Rose, deputy commissioner of human resources in New York City, who claimed there is no need to set high educational conditions for training programs "when in fact during World War II we took illiterate people and in 6 weeks made them highly skilled workers." (Transcript, p. 17)

In CIRALG's plan for FY 1978, as table 4.2 indicates, the requirements for most courses are slightly reduced, except business occupations, where requirements have been both raised and lowered. These changes do not substantially reduce the probable exclusion rate.

That some clients felt the testing process discriminatory was attested to by William Shepherd, the client affirmative action officer, who reported that, "All of them [12] that were tested [using the California test] and complained felt that it excluded them from participation in the program and they felt that that's why the test was used, more so than as a counseling tool, which they said it was supposed to be used for." (Transcript, p. 241) The California test was dropped in April 1977 and replaced by BOLT.

CIRALG records show the pattern of enrollment in the classroom program. While between February and June 1977, 7.8 percent of all the vocational trainees (33 out of 425) were black, only the clerical and building management classes had this proportion of black students. Only one Hispanic student was involved in vocational training classes during this period.[17]

From Street to Door: The Problem of Recruitment

"Zook" Williams, director of Gateway Opportunity Center, a community service agency located in the black community, told the Advisory Committee that, "what I am saying is my people are not aware of the [CETA] programs. You know, if someone would come to me tomorrow and ask me how to get into some sort of training at CIRALG, I couldn't tell you. Yet I serve a thousand people." (Transcript, p. 85) He stressed that there was no outreach to minorities. (Transcript, p. 85) The Reverend Avance Harden reported that some of his church's members told him: "I have tried Bell Avenue." Some say, "I have gone through it, and it didn't produce anything." (Transcript, p. 64)

[13] O.K. Buros, ed., *The Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook* (Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1972), vol. 1, p. 47.
[14] Ibid., vol. 2, p. 677.
[15] Data from Advisory Committee study.
[16] Carl Rolf, interview in Des Moines, May 19, 1977.
[17] Data supplied by CIRALG. DMACC data for March 1977 show a different pattern. These data suggest a lower participation rate, 6.1 percent black (8 out of 131), with copy reproduction, welding, and building management as the only classes that match the average. DMACC data show five Hispanics enrolled in March 1977.

From October 1976 until about February 1977 there was no outreach. Warren Rockhill, from Job Service, stated that the large backlog (which it inherited when it took over outreach and intake for Polk County) had to be cleared before new applicants could be sought through outreach efforts.[18] When outreach did begin, this consisted primarily of reviews of applications on file at the local Job Service office and visits to local high schools by an intake officer.[19]

The FY 1977 data on applications for Title I show that as of April 28, 1977, approximately 70.9 percent of the applicants from Polk County were white; 19.4 percent, black; 3.3 percent, Hispanic; and 6.4 percent, Vietnamese, American Indian, or other.[20] For FY 1978 CIRALG planned that 17.2 percent of its enrollees in Title I would be nonwhite (including black, American Indian, and other) as against 15 percent black, 1 percent other, and 2 percent Hispanic economically disadvantaged in the area.[21]

For FY 1978 CIRALG proposed to improve recruitment by establishing outreach stations located in the four quarters of Des Moines; they would also do intake. One of these was, in fact, placed in the black community. But a surplus of program holdovers or those processed and awaiting entry resulted in no new additions during the first month of the program.

[18] Warren Rockhill, Iowa Job Service, interview in Des Moines, Apr. 20, 1977.

[19] Grace Moore, Iowa Job Service, interview in Des Moines, Apr. 26, 1977.

[20] Data supplied by Iowa Job Service.

[21] Data supplied by CIRALG. Data subsequently supplied by CIRALG to the U.S. Department of Labor estimated the nonwhite share of the economically disadvantaged at 40 percent.

5. Job Opportunities for Minorities and Women: Public Service Employment Program (PSE)

In addition to providing training for those lacking basic vocational skills, the CETA program offers federally-funded jobs in local or State government and nonprofit agencies. Initially, Title II of CETA provided jobs for areas of very high unemployment. When the 1974 recession began, the act was amended to provide employment for the longer term unemployed (Title VI). But Federal funding practices have resulted in Des Moines PSE employees being shifted from one title program to the other in November 1976 and March 1977, depending on the availability of Federal funds. Since the eligible residents of the city of Des Moines now can be placed in either Title II or Title VI, it is logical to treat them as though they were a single program.

The National Urban League has identified some of the problems associated with PSE programs around the Nation.

> —A high percentage of the participants are unemployed but not economically disadvantaged.
>
> —A significantly high number of the participants are white.
>
> —The average wage for white participants is higher than for minority participants.
>
> —White participants are receiving more professional and technical jobs.
>
> —Minority participants are generally receiving low level unskilled jobs with minimal potential for training and economic mobility.
>
> —Minority participation under Title VI is significantly lower than in Title II, in some prime sponsor areas.
>
> —Job distribution is uneven and does not reflect proportionate distribution of regular employees in the given local government agency or among agencies.
>
> —Non-profit organizations are not being utilized to their potential, if at all.
>
> —A higher percentage of minorities are receiving semi-professional and professional positions with non-profit organizations.
>
> —Veterans are receiving a disproportionately high number of the jobs while Viet Nam Era veterans are receiving few.[1]

These serve as benchmarks for a review of the Des Moines program.

Data that would allow calculation of economic status are not contained or required on the PSE participant forms maintained by the city of Des Moines. The proportion of minorities in CIRALG's PSE programs was sufficiently similar to that in Title I to indicate that discrimination in overall enrollment does not occur. Nor do the data for the city of Des Moines segment show unequal distribution of jobs for blacks as between less skilled and greater skilled positions. A higher proportion of minorities are receiving professional or semiprofessional jobs with minority-oriented nonprofits than with other private agencies or the city of Des Moines. The Advisory Committee did not review the status of veterans. As will be described later, there are significant differences by race in the rates of transition from jobs subsidized by Federal funds to unsubsidized employment.

Utilization by Minority Nonprofit Agencies

The underutilization of minority-oriented, nonprofit agencies was challenged by six community leaders—Sidney Keahna of the American Indian

[1] National Urban League, Presentation before the National Commission on Manpower Policy on the Role of Public Service Employment, Apr. 27, 1975.

Development Center, Arzania (Zook) Williams of Gateway Opportunity Center, Steve Stegall of Inner Urban Alcohol Center, Andrew Roberts of the Iowa State Ombudsman's Office, Eddie Zamora of the Spanish Speaking Center of Des Moines, and Hector Sanchez of the Iowa Spanish Speaking Peoples' Commission. Following rejection of several applications for PSE positions, the six leaders complained to the U.S. Department of Justice's Community Relations Service on March 3, 1977. The complaint charged that CIRALG had given little attention to minority applications, rejected their applications for PSE positions, and provided no opportunity for minority participation in CETA planning.[2]

Following negotiations, a conciliation agreement was signed by CIRALG and the six leaders. Commenting on the agreement reached, Sidney Keahna stated that, "We didn't really get what we wanted, but we got a piece of the pie." (Transcript, p. 69) This included some Title VI PSE positions and representation on MAPCCI. After the Advisory Committee informed CIRALG of its study, and following the conciliation agreement, the proportion of positions assigned to minority nonprofit agencies nearly doubled, from 14 percent prior to April 1977 to 26 percent in October 1977. The proportion allocated to other private agencies rose by 1 percent during this period, while the local governmental units' share dropped from 61 percent in April 1977 to 46 percent in October 1977.[3]

This was made possible by a substantial increase in Title VI funding that CIRALG received in April 1977. CIRALG made a maximum effort to inform minority nonprofit groups that these funds could be obtained. Priority for nonprofit groups was required by the Department of Labor in the accompanying regulations.

Hiring and Utilization of Minorities and Women in PSE Jobs

Utilization of minorities and women by local governments, minority nonprofit organizations, and other private agencies varies widely. Whereas of jobs processed in the Des Moines SMSA during January-September 1977, 69 percent of the minority nonprofit agencies' PSE employees hired were black males and 14 percent were black females, only 9 percent of the governmental employers' PSE hires were black males and 13 percent were black females. In positions filled by other nonprofit agencies, 9 percent were black males and 26 percent were black females. Of CIRALG and its subcontractors' new hires under PSE, 20 percent were black males and 12 percent were black females. Perhaps most interesting is that the proportion of black male applicants who were hired, whether by governmental units, other nonprofit agencies, or CIRALG and its subcontractors, was less than the proportion of white male applicants hired by each of these. Sixty-three percent of the black males and 50 percent of black females who applied to minority nonprofit agencies for PSE positions were hired. Only 18 percent of black male and 26 percent of black female applicants for governmental unit PSE positions were hired.

There were disparities in utilization of minority employees at the semiprofessional and professional levels. These are shown in table 5.1.

Chances for placement in a PSE job for black males appear better in the minority nonprofit agencies than elsewhere. Black females had their best chance in other nonprofit agencies. White males had their best opportunity for placement in either city government, CIRALG, or its subcontractors. White females were not employed at this level by the minority nonprofit agencies.

---

[2] J. Terry Smith, former executive director of CIRALG, comments:

> When the first PSE funds were released under Title VI in early 1975, I personally held meetings with all staff involved in operations and planning encouraging contact with all private nonprofit agencies in central Iowa. In addition, specific staff were assigned to seek out such groups, advise them of the program, and encourage their participation. Also, letters of solicitation of interest were mailed to all eligible organizations encouraging their interest. [Terry Smith, letter to Melvin Jenkins, Dec. 19, 1977]

[3] Data obtained from Iowa Job Service.

Dr. Phillip Langerman, chairperson of MAPC, commenting on behalf of the MAPC states:

> With regard to Title II and Title VI PSE, there has [sic] been substantial changes made in MAPC's involvement in the evaluation of all requests for PSE positions. It would be well that this be reflected in your report. MAPC at the present time reviews every application. A system has been designed of assigning points to each application and funding has been based on that point priority. [Phillip Langerman, letter to Peg Anderson, Dec. 16, 1977]

The consolidated regulations for Title VI specify that:

> Prime sponsors and program agents should give consideration to providing a substantial portion [one-third] of the project funds to project applicants which are non-profit agencies. [These are funds left after existing local government and other CETA positions are maintained.] [42 Fed. Reg. 55,780 (1977)]

TABLE 5.1

Proportions of Minorities and Women Hired Under the Public Service Employment Program in Either Professional or Semiprofessional Positions by CIRALG and Its Subcontractors, Nonprofit Agencies, and Governmental Units in the Des Moines SMSA

	White		Black	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
CIRALG and its subcontractors	40.0%	33.3%	13.4%	13.3%
All governmental units in Des Moines SMSA	40.0	33.3	16.7	10.0
Minority nonprofits	8.0	0.0	72.0	20.0
Other nonprofits	21.1	31.6	5.3	42.1

Note: These are persons hired by each type of employer, divided by race and sex.
Source: Iowa Job Service Historical fiche records, January–October 1977.

The Advisory Committee was able to obtain some data on the applicant flow in the city of Des Moines.[4] Minority applications for city jobs do not appear disproportionately low—about 1 in 10 is a minority. But of those PSE applicants who could be traced to a civil service list only 1 in 19 was a minority.[5] Yet even this percentage exceeds the minority share of the Des Moines employed labor force.

Transition from Federally-Funded Jobs to Unsubsidized Employment

The General Accounting Office has been concerned about the lack of movement of the unemployed from federally-funded to unsubsidized jobs. It notes that:

> U.S. Department of Labor requires each sponsor, to the extent possible, to have as an annual goal to either (1) place half of the participants in unsubsidized private or public employment or (2) place participants in half of the sponsor's suitable vacancies.
>
> Nevertheless, current legislation states that the U.S. Department of Labor cannot require a sponsor to place a specific number or proportion of participants into unsubsidized jobs.
>
> Further, placement goals must not be identified as requirements. Sponsors can request a waiver of such goals if the sponsor considers them infeasible and the Secretary agrees that local conditions warrant a waiver.[6]

Under revised CETA regulations from the U.S. Department of Labor governing the new Title VI funding, prime sponsors are required "to the extent feasible. . .to enable all individuals to move from [subsidized] employment programs into unsubsidized full-time jobs in the private or public sector. . . ."[7] Prior to May 1977, the Department of Labor also specified a goal of 50 percent of those terminated from Title II being moved into unsubsidized public or private employment subject to civil service or collective bargaining agreements, unless the employee refused a job. A numerical goal is not required now.[8]

City Manager Wilkey told the Advisory Committee regarding transitions:

> We try to look at it [CETA positions] from two or three perspectives. Number one, will the applicant who fills the position have a possibility of transition? Is this a slot that can be

[4] Not all PSE enrollees' names appear on city civil service lists, reflecting the rush to get candidates employed, as normal civil service procedures ran slower than Federal pressure for rapid hire allowed.

[5] Data obtained from analysis of city civil service lists for FY 1975 and 1976 based on names provided by CIRALG.

[6] U.S., General Accounting Office, *More Benefits to Jobless Can Be Attained in Public Service Employment*, HRD 77-53 (Apr. 7, 1977), p. 26.

[7] 42 Fed. Reg. 55,758 (1977).

[8] Ibid.

TABLE 5.2

City of Des Moines, Transitions to City or Private Employment as a Proportion of Terminations (Percentage of Ethnic Group in Category)

	Male		Female		Total transitioned
	White	Black	White	Black	
Laborer & kindred	39%	20%	0%	0%	36%
Professional and semiprofessional	25	0	46	43	31
Clerical	0	0	38	0	33
Total	37	13	38	38	34

Note: The numbers are the proportion of the ethnic group terminated who were moved in each occupational category. This table summarizes 20 tables (the termination statistics for each ethnic and sex group in each job category). The data cannot be added to total 100% of either ethnic group or job category.

Source: City of Des Moines data.

meaningful to the applicant, or is it one of these dead-end situations?

Of course, we attempt to make appointments that will lead to permanent city employment through expected turnover, that sort of thing, so that after a while if he has learned a job, he can qualify for it.

Another consideration, of course, is how will this job serve the community and the needs that we have to provide services? I think that has a bearing on whether the job will be kept or not, because if it isn't essential, I think the likelihood of him being placed in a permanent job is less, so we take all this into consideration and the needs of the city and the community and the needs of the applicant, and it is not a definite science. There is some crystal balling in this, but we try to eliminate the unexpected or unanticipated factors in that fashion. (Transcript, pp. 212–13).

Table 5.2 shows the proportions of transitions according to occupational group. In each occupational group minority males got fewer transitions to unsubsidized employment than did white males (19 percent fewer labor jobs, 25 percent fewer professional or equivalent jobs). A much larger proportion of white females (38 percent) than black females (none) was moved into unsubsidized clerical jobs, but the total transition rate for black females was the same as for white females (38 percent). The total transition rate for white males was 37 percent, and for black males it was 13 percent. The city of Des Moines' personnel director explained that transition to public employment is difficult because State law mandates that local governments with civil service systems (such as Des Moines) give absolute preference (irrespective of qualifications) to veterans who apply.[9]

To get these jobs, and the opportunity for making the transition, applicants had to fill out a city application form, go to Iowa Job Service to be declared eligible, return to city hall with the certificate, and proceed through the normal process of testing and interviews. For a while in fall 1976 there was a long delay getting the needed certificate from Job Service. This was ended when CIRALG assigned extra personnel to the Job Service office. The city found this system inconvenienced everyone, but could do nothing to change it.[10]

[9] Jerry Thompson, interview in Des Moines, May 18, 1977.

[10] Kevin Burt, interview in Des Moines, Apr. 29, 1977.

6. The "Creaming" Dilemma

"Creaming" in employment and training program jargon is the practice of accepting only the best-qualified candidates for admission to a program, irrespective of whether these are the candidates most in need of the services offered or whether admission of such candidates runs counter to the program goal of serving those most disadvantaged. It is practiced primarily to make the program appear to function effectively, as it takes in the more talented people. It is criticized for ignoring the most needy, while helping those who could have found jobs on their own. (Transcript, pp. 27-29).

Table 6.1 shows the prior income levels of CETA participants. Before becoming eligible for CETA, 22 percent of the participants in Title I had wages of $4.00 per hour or more. One-quarter of Title II and 44 percent of Title VI participants earned more than $4.00 per hour before enrolling in CETA. While all of these applicants have ostensibly met the legal eligibility requirements, persons with prior histories of more than $4.00 per hour wages ought to have less trouble reentering the employed labor force unassisted than those with fewer skills and lesser degrees of employability. But they are desirable CETA clients, given the high demands for transition to employment in Title I. Since there are no inflexible goals in the Titles II and VI programs, these could absorb a greater share of hard-to-place applicants.[1]

Robert Gatewood, area operations chief in Iowa for the U.S. Department of Labor, stated that, under congressional mandate, the Department and its regional offices have been negotiating with prime sponsors to increase their rate of Title I placement of clients by between 5 to 10 percent per year. This, he concluded, "could have the effect of making it more

[1] The current chairperson of the manpower area planning committee, Dr. Phillip D. Langerman, commenting on behalf of the MAPC, states that:

> The concept that was developed last fiscal year, was one of making optimum use of the funds available, to serve as many clients as possible of the protected classes who could profit from Manpower training programs. We do not perceive that to be a concept that can be called "creaming." We did, by design, attempt to eliminate some individuals [sic] from past experience who have not been employable after training or have participated in Manpower programs over and over without being able to secure employment. We felt this was an inappropriate drain on our limited funds, which you will recall were cut 40% in that fiscal year. We believe that we have met the intent of the law and we are ever striving to serve those individuals for which the CETA programs were designed. . . .We believe we have made every effort to try to compensate for the higher unemployment that is experienced by younger adults, especially minorities and women. [Phillip D. Langerman, letter to Peg Anderson, Dec. 16, 1977]

The significant population base for determining appropriate participation levels is not the whole population (who are not properly the targets of the CETA effort), but rather the economically disadvantaged population (whether temporarily or long term). CIRALG's own data on these suggest that 15 percent of the CIRALG-area economically disadvantaged are black and 2 percent are Hispanic. Yet, in its FY 1978 planning estimates, CIRALG reports that about 40 percent of the economically disadvantaged are nonwhite.

Although CIRALG reports that 77.3 percent of its Title I participants are economically disadvantaged, it provides no breakdown on the ethnic characteristics of these disadvantaged. The Advisory Committee study of 299 applicants done in April 1977 showed that 35.3 percent of white male, 46.2 percent of white female, 83.3 percent of black male, and 75 percent of black female participants had more than 31 out of a possible 49 points on CIRALG's own priority scale (CIRALG viewed 29 as an "average score"). It would appear that a far larger proportion of minorities than white males met the test of significant need for service. Yet these ratios are not reflected in the racial distribution of all Polk County Title I participants. If they were, there would be two black males in the program for every white male.

The Advisory Committee has recognized the fiscal pressure under which CIRALG's CETA program operates. It remains unconvinced that any strategy for intake which encourages selection of only the applicants most easily placed can be regarded as anything other than creaming. Dr. Langerman asserts that those not selected are those who have proved difficult to train in the past. The Advisory Committee agrees that many of these might not finish training under the existing program. But it also believes that such persons are the appropriate target for a Title I effort. In this view it is supported by the regulations for CETA, which specify that, "it is the purpose of the ACT to provide job training and employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged, unemployed and underemployed persons and to assure that training and other services lead to maximum economic opportunities and enhance self-sufficiency." (42 Fed. Reg. 55,726 (1977)) The 1976 *Employment and Training Report of the President* makes clear that the CETA program is to be directed "particularly [to] the disadvantaged." (The President of the United States, *Employment and Training Report of the President* (1976), p. 88.) While this mandate has been somewhat obscured by other prescriptions from the Department of Labor, the Advisory Committee believes that prime sponsors have a continuing obligation to seek to serve the disadvantaged in Title I programs to a far greater extent than Dr. Langerman regards as appropriate. It should also be noted that not all MAPC members have agreed with Dr. Langerman's position, as comments by several other members during the Advisory Committee's June meeting indicate. (See: Transcript, pp. 154ff, 175ff.) Similar comments have also been made in interviews by representatives of the Des Moines Area Community College and at the factfinding meeting by the U.S. Department of Labor. Others have pointed out that such clients can complete training, given proper support. (Transcript, pp. 17ff., and staff interviews with Carroll Bennett and Carl Rolf.)

TABLE 6.1

Prior Income (Hourly Wage) of CETA Participants as a Proportion of Clients (FY 1977)

	Title I	Title II	Title VI
Number of clients	559	20	39
No previous wage	10.9%	10%	5.1%
Less than $2.00	7.5	20	2.6
$2.00–2.99	36.9	20	20.5
$3.00–3.99	22.3	25	28.2
Sum of the above	77.6	75	56.4
$4.00–4.99	12.7	10	23.1
$5.00–5.99	6.3	10	12.8
$6.00 or more	3.4	5	7.7
Sum of $4.00 or more	22.4	25	43.6

Note: Hourly wage may not reflect annual wage, because some CETA clients have a history of part-time high wage but low-skill emploment. However, this is, at the present time the only estimator available.

Source: CIRALG

difficult to place the economically disadvantaged in the program, especially minorities and women."[2] Such participants would be hard to place following training and adversely affect the prime sponsor's performance statistics.

The effect of this in Des Moines was confirmed by the former chairperson of the manpower area planning council, who told the Advisory Committee that the placement goals set for the training program had been required of the CIRALG by a Federal representative from the Department of Labor, Region VII. (Transcript, pp. 197–98) But the prime sponsor could have set a lower placement rate, without risking loss of Federal funding. (Transcript, p. 332) Secretary of Labor Ray Marshall, in written response to questions submitted by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, acknowledged that a "creaming" problem exists, but said that "prime sponsors should not feel the need to 'cream' in making participant selections in order to achieve a satisfactory evaluation."[3]

Creaming in Title I

Table 2.2 in chapter 2 shows that 47.6 percent of those served by the Title I training program in FY 1977 had less than 12 years of schooling. But CIRALG planned that only 23.3 percent of those with less than 12 years of schooling would be served in Title I in FY 1978. Table 2.3 shows that 20.7 percent of those served in Title I in FY 1977 were AFDC recipients and 6.4 percent were recipients of other forms of public assistance. For FY 1978, CIRALG planned that 28.6 percent of those served would be public assistance recipients.

Table 2.4 shows that 20.7 percent of those served in Title I were nonwhite. But for FY 1978 it planned that only 17.2 percent would be nonwhite.

For both FY 1977 and 1978, CIRALG required that its Title I subcontractors achieve a "nonpositive termination rate" (persons leaving the program at any time prior to placement following training divided by total terminations) of not more than 30 percent. The actual rate achieved by the two subcontractors in FY 1977 was much higher, 44.8 percent.[4] (The actual rates exceed the 30 percent goal in every quarter except June 1975.)

For FY 1977, CIRALG required that the Title I placement subcontractors achieve an "indirect

[2] Robert Gatewood, interview in Kansas City, Mo., Nov. 2, 1977; and Richard Miskimins, letter to Melvin Jenkins, Dec. 19, 1977.

[3] Ray Marshall, Secretary of Labor, letter to Arthur S. Flemming, Nov. 15, 1977.

[4] A nonpositive termination occurs if the client is: "laid off, leaves for health/pregnancy reasons, family care, transportation problems, moves from the area, refuses to continue, administrative separation, cannot be located, other. . . ." U.S., Department of Labor, *Forms Preparation Handbook, ET Handbook No. 103* (Oct. 22, 1976), p. VI–10.

placement rate" (placements following training divided by total terminations)[5] of not less than 65 percent. For FY 1978, it allowed all placements (whether following training, before training, or as a result of the client's own efforts) to be counted and held the rate at 65 percent.

For the first time, in FY 1978, the community college (DMACC) was given fixed performance standards and the right to refuse students who did not meet the agreed-upon guidelines. To protect itself, DMACC will have to enforce the guidelines for minimum achievement by clients prior to admission. With the level of students provided in FY 1977, DMACC estimated it was achieving a completion rate of about 65 percent. The new plan requires a rate of 80 percent.[6] Janet Zobel, of the National Urban League, told the Advisory Committee that fewer minorities and disadvantaged have been served by CETA programs because the minimum education requirements have risen. (Transcript, pp. 28–29).

In FY 1977, CIRALG required an average wage of $3.25 per hour. In FY 1978 it required an average wage of $3.60 per hour. CIRALG staff state that persons with low educational achievement can be admitted to the class-size training because, while they may not receive the target average wage upon completion, others enrolled in other segments of the program will receive more than average. Typical of these high wages are those received by persons who complete the CETA-funded training provided by Ryder Trucks. However, Ryder requires a minimum of 11th grade education to enter its program. Overall, while in a 4-1/2 month period surveyed by CIRALG, 41 percent of all class-size program trainees had less than a high school degree, 29 percent of those in "individual training" were at this level. (CIRALG states that the relevant disparity is 11.1 average years of schooling for class training as against 11.8 percent average years of schooling for individual training.)

The Department of Labor asserts that inadequate data for programs prior to CETA make comparisons to CETA difficult or impossible.[7] While hard evidence for such a comparison is not available in Des Moines, Virgil Miller, once associated with the concentrated employment program, told the Advisory Committee staff that minority participation flourished under CEP. It was necessary to recruit whites into the program because there were so many qualified black applicants.[8] The same has not been true of CETA because of: (1) broader eligibility requirements, (2) greater participation of suburban communities, (3) increasing use of programs by victims of the recession, and (4) the inclination of some program managers to enroll persons most likely to succeed rather than those most in need of manpower training.[9]

Creaming in Public Service Employment

It has been contended nationally that public employers also "cream" by failing to take account of minorities, women, and the disadvantaged in their selection of jobs and their choice of participants. Janet Zobel of the National Urban League told the Advisory Committee that local governments around the country fail to select PSE positions in the light of the education levels of the disadvantaged and set

[5] The Department of Labor handbook states: "An indirect placement occurs if the client is placed in unsubsidized employment after participating in CETA funded training, employment or supportive services." U.S., Department of Labor, *Forms Preparation Handbook*, p. VII–14.

[6] Contracts for FY 1977 and Request for Proposals for FY 1978 supplied by CIRALG. Carl Rolf, interview in Des Moines, May 19, 1977.

[7] Richard Miskimins, letter to Melvin Jenkins, Dec. 19, 1977.

Dr. Phillip Langerman, commenting on behalf of the MAPC, states:

> We believe that statistics show that when we were operating under category programs, the number of minorities and women served was not as great as it is now under the CETA funded Manpower delivery system. It seems to us that we have made every attempt to serve as high a percentage as possible of minorities and women in Title I, Title II, Title III and Title IV CETA funded programs. We believe that the delivery system developed under CETA is a better delivery system than what we were operating under categorical programs, MDTA, CEP, and the like, prior to 1974. We believe that we have always had the interest and concern of the protected classes of minorities, disadvantaged, women and so forth, as the prime objective of our CETA funded programs. We have been diligent in our efforts to design programs to meet the needs of those groups. Our planning document, outlining the groups to be served, expresly shows this intent. [Dr. Phillip Langerman, letter to Peg Anderson, Dec. 16, 1977]

The question is whether a larger *proportion* of minorities are served relative to population than were served prior to CETA. On this the only available evidence is that cited. The Advisory Committee did not attempt to assess the *quality* of the training programs provided before and after CETA. But it has noted complaints in the national literature about this. See: William Mirengoff and Lester Rindler, *The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1976, pp. 7, 12, 120ff.

The impact this transition has had on minorities has been addressed by Janet Zobel in her testimony. (Transcript, pp. 21–22) Other relevant national studies include: Southern Regional Council, *The Job Ahead: Manpower Policies in the South* (Atlanta: Southern Regional Council, July 1975); and North Carolina Manpower Development Corporation, *An Analytical Study of CETA Planning and Program Implementation in North Carolina and South Carolina, Fiscal 1975, Part I: Conclusions and Recommendations* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: North Carolina Manpower Development Corporation, August 1975); SER/Jobs for Progress, Inc., *The Impact of the First Year Implementation of CETA on the Spanish Speaking* (Los Angeles: SER, November 1975).

[8] Virgil Miller, interview in Des Moines, Apr. 28, 1977.

[9] Mirengoff and Rindler, *CETA*. . ., p. 11.

required skills higher than really necessary. (Transcript, p. 30)

An examination was made of the city of Des Moines' files on past and present PSE employees in October 1977. Of those hired in clerical jobs, a smaller proportion of white females (25 percent) than black females (37.5 percent) had more than 12 years of schooling. A large proportion of both white and black males (64.9 percent and 64.2 percent, respectively) who were given laborer or similar jobs had at least 12 years of schooling.[10]

Since the median years of schooling for all persons in the city of Des Moines (from which all candidates had to come) was 12.4 years, it is clear that the city is accepting at the median, rather than those with below average educational achievement. Since black residents of Des Moines have completed a median of 11.5 years of school,[11] the city is drawing upon black applicants well above that median.

In higher level jobs, above laborer or clerk-typist, all the white women and half of the black women had more than 12 years of schooling. For males the figures are 39 percent for whites and 33 percent for blacks.[12] In part, enrollee credentials reflect the kinds of jobs available. But, as the Urban League points out, the criteria for positions selected for PSE may also be a form of creaming. (Transcript, p. 30) Des Moines City Manager Richard Wilkey told the Advisory Committee in June 1977:

> That's a difficult area to reach, the hard-core unemployed, and I recognize that. One of the steps we have taken to make some inroads along that area is that, I believe, in February, if my memory is correct, of this year [1977] we made a personal goal of attempting to place into CETA jobs those individuals that met, I believe, the 15-week unemployment criteria, the most stringent criteria, in other words, and to concentrate in those out of Title VI [sic].
>
> I haven't reviewed the statistics recently, but I believe about 50 persons have been hired since that time. All but two or three have been on the criteria that are more difficult for placement, which is the 15-week criteria, which would indicate that if a person has been out of work that long, he is more hard-core unemployed than one who has been out of work for a 30-day period. (Transcript, p. 217)

A review of the city of Des Moines' files on past and present PSE employees showed that 45 percent of all PSE participants and 41 percent of PSE Title VI participants (that is, persons who were selected because they could not find work rather than because they lived in an area of particularly high unemployment) had been unemployed for less than 15 weeks before hired under PSE. All had been certified as eligible by Job Service of Iowa.

[10] Data from city of Des Moines CETA files.

[11] Median years of school drawn from U.S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *1970 Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics (Iowa)*, tables 91, 93. The few GEDs that might be excluded from these figures may not be a factor.

[12] Data from city of Des Moines CETA files.

7. Problems in the Administration of the CETA Program

Administrative problems affect the entire program. They are not discriminatory in intent, but may be discriminatory in effect. The management information system (MIS) is not capable of rapidly and regularly determining whether discrimination exists in each and every aspect of the program. Without easily accessible information beyond that required by the Department of Labor, detailed program review is difficult. The Title I program has also experienced difficulties in meeting its goals for enrollments and placements. While there is no evidence of a discriminatory impact as such on enrollments, any program that benefits minorities and women may cause them disproportionate harm if not completely effective.

The allocation of public servi[illegible] positions to the city and nonprofit [illegible] a source of friction in the comm[illegible] this issue is the extent of [illegible] PSE funding. This invol[illegible] of PSE to reduce local [illegible] additional positions.

The whole program ha[illegible] services that might benefi[illegible] vantaged of all races by [illegible]ng the kinds of assistance that would enable participation, completion, and movement into unsubsidized employment. The regulations allow services such as counseling, transportation, health care, legal aid, and cash payments in addition to vocational counseling and placement.

Beginning in FY 1977, CIRALG undertook to create an automated management information system capable of addressing its various needs. At the moment the system is designed only to provide sufficient data to generate Department of Labor-required reports. This was to be implemented in FY 1978. By October 1978 the system will allow tracking of clients in program activities on the basis of race, sex, and economic status to ensure that discrimination does not exist in the program. However, the system will not be able to track individual training classes or the intake-assessment process.[1] For FY 1977 the prime sponsor attempted to determine the race and sex of participants in various components of the program. But internal evaluations based on this data have been limited to a comparison of class-size versus individualized training. There has been no similar analysis of OJT, although CIRALG staff have stated that this and individualized training are better than class-size training, which will ultimately be phased out.

Table 7.1 shows the proportion of those who became employed following training through the efforts of the program (indirect placement) and those who failed to complete the program (nonpositive terminations). Although it fulfilled less of its [illegible] than its colleagues in the region or Nation, CIRALG was more successful than its colleagues around the country or in Region VII (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska) in its proportion of clients from the Title I program who entered employment following training. But while 41.8 percent of all whites who were terminated became employed, only 25 percent of blacks and 23 percent of Hispanics found jobs.

CIRALG placed only two-thirds as many as planned PSE Title VI clients in the private sector or locally funded government jobs. Its colleagues in the region and Nation did better. But CIRALG's placement rate was higher. A larger proportion of CIRALG's PSE enrollees dropped out than did so elsewhere.[2]

[1] Peter Raimondo, telephone interview, Jan. 3, 1978.

[2] The Department of Labor commented: "The performance of other CETA programs may be one indicator of program success, but is hardly a final test of either a sponsor's implementation of its current plan or its

TABLE 7.1

Performance in CETA

	DOL indirect placement rate (number placed divided by number employed)		% of indirect placements (number indirect placements divided by number total terminations)	Nonpositive termination (number nonpositive terminations divided by number terminated)		Enrollment number (actual enrollment divided by number planned enrollments)
	(% of plan)	(Actual rate)	(Actual rate)	(% of plan)	(Actual rate)	(% of plan)
			Performance in Title I			
National	86.4	62.9	24.5	120.9	29.7	105.2
Regional	94.7	74.2	32.5	130.1	29.2	114.3
CIRALG	69.7	78.5	30.6	231.0	44.8	14.3
			Performance in Title II			
CIRALG	105.9	100.0	13.1	370.0	21.0	158.3
			Performance In Title VI			
National	115.4	51.8	19.3	104.8	45.5	219.2
Regional	75.5	56.7	16.5	152.7	51.7	130.0
CIRALG	63.8	76.9	22.4	352.2	60.4	216.4

Note: Title II programs were subject to constant fluctuation in Federal funding during the year. Prime sponsors' arrangements to cope with fluctuations varied too widely to make meaningful comparisons. Indirect placement rate is at best an approximate measure of success, but it is the only measure available.

Sources: Quarterly report by CIRALG, Dec. 31, 1977. U.S. Department of Labor records.

Table 7.2 shows the percentage of planned accomplishments by the two subcontractors. It suggests that Job Service was having a much harder time reaching its goals than was Greater Opportunities, although neither was reaching its targets. There were also problems in keeping classes filled.[3]

The General Accounting Office reviewed several programs, not including Des Moines, and concluded that:

> Public employment programs have increased job opportunities. These opportunities are diminished, however, when departments or agencies use CETA participants to fill vacant, temporary, part-time, or seasonal positions; rehire laid-off former employees using CETA funds; and use CETA participants to provide service normally contracted out. The frequency of these activities cannot be determined with available data.[4]

City Manager Richard Wilkey explained how the city justifies its use of PSE positions.

> We are getting back to the limit we have on funding, and it may appear that we are utilizing CETA positions for previously tax-supported positions because with raises and inflation and so on some positions have to be deleted in order to balance the budget and certify to the State; consequently, maybe 2 or 3 years ago or even last year there would be some positions that were under the regular funding but, now, because of union contracts and creation, and so on, we have to—because we are about 70 to 75 percent labor-intensive—we have to make sure of our cuts. . .[in specific areas]. It is because of the financial constraints placed on us by State legislation, and in some instances we have refilled these positions with CETA money. We are up to the limit on our existing money. (Transcript, pp. 235–36)

Although Des Moines did run substantial deficits in FY 1972, 1973, 1974, and 1975–76, it was in surplus during FY 1976–77 and FY 1977–78 thanks to Federal funds. The principal concern of the GAO and the Department of Labor is that CETA funds not be used to fund positions that would be funded by the local government in the absence of CETA money. It is very difficult to trace such transfers. GAO suggests an elaborate accounting procedure. But neither the city nor CIRALG maintains the requisite data.[5] In the absence of such data, only 1 job slot out of 82 could be traced. The city

---

compliance with the CETA Act and Regulations." (Richard Miskimins, letter to Melvin Jenkins, Dec. 19, 1977)

In a study for the U.S. Department of Labor, Ohio State University reported that, for the period December 1974-June 1976, CIRALG's indirect placement and nonpositive termination rates were consistently above the national average. Given statistics cited by the Ohio State study, there is every reason to report the new data and wonder at the difference between the record pre-June 1976 and afterwards. (Ohio State University, CETA Study, *Progress Report: CETA Prime Sponsor Management Decisions and Program Goal Achievement* (Jan. 31, 1977), pp. 100–03.)

The Advisory Committee agrees that comparative analysis is only one indicator of program success. But given the differences between planned efforts and actual accomplishments, reported by CIRALG, and illustrated in this chapter, some comparative analysis is appropriate to determine whether CIRALG's difficulties are unique or characteristic of the CETA effort.

[3] Anthony Gales, memorandum to Warren Rockhill and James Underwood, Mar. 25, 1977.

[4] U.S., General Accounting Office, *More Benefits to Jobless Can Be Attained in Public Service Employment*, HRD 77-53 (Apr. 7, 1977), p. 21. (Hereafter cited as GAO, *More Benefits*.)

[5] The city comments:

> Various percentages are used in an effort to compare revenue vs. expenditures for the City of Des Moines. In addition, the following inaccurate conclusion is stated: "In short, the fiscal stringency of which City Manager Richard Wilkey complains is not entirely accurate for the current time period." It is impossible to address a statement containing ambiguous terms such as "entirely" and "the current time," but the percentages need to be discussed.
>
> The report is unclear as to what figures were manipulated to arrive at the percentages. However, if the calculations were accurate the results would be meaningless since the methodology is obviously faulty. Calculating the financial position of a City is considerably more complex than dividing total revenue by total expenditures for a fiscal period. Obviously, certain revenues are restricted for specific purposes and not available for general operations. In addition, accruals affect both revenues and expenditures and shift both revenue and expense between fiscal years which creates fund balances and subsequent liabilities. It is apparent that the writer of the report does not have a clear understanding of fund accounting, the revenue sources available to the City, or the restrictions placed upon the City's primary revenue source, property taxes, by the State. It is difficult to understand how the conclusion arrived at in the report regarding the City's fiscal condition could result after a comprehensive review of financial records. [Jerry Thompson, employment relations director, City of Des Moines, letter to Melvin Jenkins, Dec. 19, 1977]

The data used are City of Des Moines, *Operating Budget*, 1977–78, and 1976–77; *Financial Tables*.

The General Accounting Office has suggested a set of analyses to document maintenance of effort. Copies of these suggestions and the comments by GAO were provided to the City of Des Moines prior to the review. These include:

1. overall and departmental budgeted revenue and expenditures over 3-5 years to note trends
2. salary line items and staffing levels to note trends
3. surpluses and deficits over a period of time to determine the trends and financial position of the sponsor
4. the use of Federal revenue sharing funds
5. vacancies filled by the sponsor
6. interviews with city officials and CETA supervisors and participants. [GAO, *More Benefits* pp. 20–21]

In interviews with the city personnel and budget officers, staff were told that data which documented existing vacancies and how they were filled over a period of time were not available. They were told the only budget data available were contained in the budget. When city officials were asked what data they maintained to document maintenance of effort, they referred to the budget. But the assistant employment relations manager and city budget officer were asked for supporting evidence. A written request was made on June 21, 1977. No data were provided beyond the budget. GAO reports that in March 1976 the Department of Labor told its regional offices to be prepared to analyze (1) tax revenue changes, (2) diversion of funds, (3) personnel cutbacks, (4) changes in the status of regular personnel, (5) comparison of jobs performed by CETA participants in relation to

employed five housing specialists and one CETA housing specialist in FY 1976–77. During FY 1977–1978 it proposes to have only four city-paid housing specialists and three CETA-paid housing specialists.[6]

Another concern has been the availability of "supportive services" for clients. The GAO, commenting on the PSE program, has noted that sponsors generally did not provide support services such as child care and transportation to CETA participants because: (1) CETA was viewed as an employment program with limited funds; (2) participants were handled like regular employees; (3) they felt it was not an urgent problem; and (4) it would impose too much of an administrative burden.[7] This was true in Des Moines. A comparison of available services for all programs in the region may be found in appendix A.

Questions were raised about the level of counseling support provided by CIRALG for training program participants. In FY 1977 the teaching subcontractor, DMACC, lost the right to provide its own counselors for students who then had to rely on the intake-assessment counselors from Job Service and Greater Opportunities. Job Service reports that its counselors were available in the training facility on a regular basis.[8] The quantity or quality of such service could not be determined. No counseling and other services were provided to PSE clients. The PSE coordinators at CIRALG contend that counseling and other services are available, but stated that supplementary training or assistance with personal problems is not necessary. (Transcript, p. 109)

A major issue has been the kind of training that should be offered applicants who do not meet the minimum educational levels required for placement in the vocational classes. James Underwood, director of Greater Opportunities, noted that adult education was eliminated due to fiscal stringency. He pointed out that, "the goal and the philosophy of the plan [for FY 1977] was to serve those who required the least expenditure of funds; that is, those who already possessed educational skills and were motivated toward self-sufficiency." (Transcript, p. 157) He pointed out that the program operators felt caught between the success rate demanded by DOL, the need to serve as many people as possible with limited dollars, and the desire to serve the severely disadvantaged. He pointed out that "These are not compatible positions. . . ." (Transcript, p. 158)

Ernest Comito, former chairperson of the planning council, stated that:

> I think that a certain amount of funds have to be set aside to help the people that need additional services to become part of the training program. If they need a GED or if they need a supportive service of any kind, a certain amount of funds should be set aside for this purpose, and in the performance standard it should be recognized that everybody cannot come into the training program and go through in the set time and come out and get a job right away. (Transcript, p. 178)

Compensatory education was provided in the FY 1978 plan.[9] The client could be offered adult basic education as a prelude to a vocational program. However, since adult basic education classes meet fewer hours per week than vocational classes, stipends and allowances could be reduced to about one-quarter of those paid to vocational students. This is not always the case. Some students could have 38 hours a week of basic education. Others could combine part-time basic education with part-time vocational training.

In order to meet the needs of clients in a constantly changing job market, CIRALG abandoned its own training facility in FY 1978 and chose to contract for both class-size and individual training

vacant positions (ibid., p. 18).

The city of Des Moines was not prepared to supply assembled data on these points to show maintenance of effort, although they might reasonably expect DOL to call upon them to do so.

[6] The city commented:

> The City has not intentionally used CETA funds to replace city-funded positions. CETA employees are hired into the city's existing position classifications and, as a result, occasionally a position has been filled under CETA at approximately the same time a similar city-funded position was eliminated. In these cases, a detailed review of the two jobs should have been made to determine if they were in the same department and if duties were the same. Such a review distinctly was not made. [Jerry Thompson, letter to Melvin Jenkins, Dec. 19, 1977]

Copies of documents showing how this analysis was conducted for a few CETA positions were requested in writing on June 21, 1977, and orally on various occasions, most recently on Oct. 20, 1977. What was supplied as examples, chosen by the city, were routine personnel requisitions. These provided no justification for maintenance of effort. (Kevin Burt, assistant employee relations director, letter to staff, Oct. 31, 1977)

[7] GAO, *More Benefits*, pp. 31–32.

[8] Marc Sprenger, letter to Melvin Jenkins, Dec. 16, 1977. Mr. Sprenger states that counselors were required to see their participant clients every other week.

[9] Anthony Gales stated that counselors could schedule adult basic education with CETA funding under the FY 1977 plan. (Transcript, p. 299) This was done occasionally. But Marc Sprenger of Iowa Job Service states that: "The Job Service contract specifically forbade expenditure of funds for this activity. The best we could do was referral to the centers and hope that the centers would provide the training free. (See page 2-7 of the work statement in the contract between the prime sponsor and Job Service.)" (Marc Sprenger, letter to Melvin Jenkins, Dec. 16, 1977) CIRALG staff state these are not contradictory.

TABLE 7.2

Percentage of Goal Accomplished in Adult Title I by Job Service and Greater Opportunities (percent of expected achievement to March 31, 1977)

	This month			This year		
	JS	GO	Overall	JS	GO	Overall
New enrollment	53.0	114.0	78.7	65.0	89.3	76.0
Total termination	109.0	161.0	131.0	86.8	94.8	90.0
Entered employment	68.4	150.0	106.0	61.9	93.7	75.7
Direct placement	—	—	—	—	—	—
Indirect placement	28.0	160.0	87.8	52.0	96.0	71.0
Found own job	800.0	—	400.0	300.0	50.0	188.0
Other positive termination	75.0	66.6	71.4	20.0	13.6	17.3
Nonpositive termination	271.0	183.0	230.0	195.0	143.0	173.0

Note: The goals in the tables used by CIRALG for these tables are not those used in the quarterly report summarized in Table 8.1. The quarterly plan goals are lower and conform to a Title I modification signed by CIRALG on Feb. 11, 1977.

Source: CIRALG, Apr. 28, 1977.

by annual contract with suppliers such as the Des Moines Area Community College which possessed the facilities to provide specialized classes. For CIRALG, this would allow rapid adjustment to changing market requirements unhampered by commitments to capital equipment. For FY 1978, however, this meant that many of the vocational classes were offered at the community college's main campus in Ankeny, 10 miles from downtown. The Des Moines Metropolitan Transit Authority provides no bus service from Des Moines to the college campus.[10] Eventually, the college may have a full-scale urban campus near the black community if political disputes can be resolved. CIRALG reported its car pool system provided an effective transportation system.[11] At least for FY 1978 only the business occupations and adult basic education services are available to those who must use public transportation.

[10] Des Moines Metropolitan Transit Authority, information service, telephone interview, Dec. 29, 1977.

[11] Gary Evans, CIRALG director of human resources, interview in Des Moines, Feb. 24, 1978.

3. The Community's Involvement in the CETA Program and its Administration

Community participation in decisions about block grant expenditures has been much discussed for all three of the major block grant programs: general revenue sharing, community development block grants, and Comprehensive Employment and Training Act grants. On all three there has been concern that minorities and women have not participated meaningfully in the decisionmaking process. In CIRALG's CETA program, opportunities for community participation occur at two points: in the CIRALG board and in the CETA program's Manpower Area Planning Council of Central Iowa. Minorities and women may also have influence as employees of the CETA administrator, CIRALG, the city of Des Moines, or the local jurisdictions represented on CIRALG.

Manpower Area Planning Council

In a report for the National Academy of Sciences, William Mirengoff and Lester Rindler explain the purpose of the planning councils.

> The framers of CETA viewed the local advisory council as the vehicle through which broad participation in the manpower activities could be realized. They carefully specified its membership: representatives of client groups, community based organizations, the employment service, education and training agencies and institutions, business, labor. . . .[1]

The authors conclude that in consortiums such as Des Moines, which was not part of the study sample, "community action agencies and other community-based organizations are less influential [than they were prior to CETA] and have encountered problems."[2] The complaints of such organizations ranged from outright exclusion to underrepresentation.[3]

Prior to April 1977 the only minority-based agency represented on the Manpower Area Planning Council of Central Iowa (MAPCCI) was Greater Opportunities, Inc., which at the time was a program subcontractor. Under the conciliation agreement referred to in chapter 5, the representatives of these organizations were appointed to MAPCCI. But one of the community leaders told the Advisory Committee that this was insufficient. "Zook" Williams said, "MAPCCI is an advisory board, and certainly, you know, you can advise me all day long, and when I go behind closed doors in the meeting, I do as I please, and it is split up the way I think it should be split up." (Transcript, pp. 76–77)

Professor Randall B. Ripley of Ohio State University, and his co-authors, in a study of Ohio CETA programs suggested that, "The influence of the manpower planning councils depends on two principal factors: (1) the attitude of the staff and political officials toward council participation. . . . (2) the attitude of the council members themselves." He argues that a planning council can do no more than the program staff and political officials who run the staff will allow.[4] In a preliminary report on 15 CETA programs, including CIRALG's, Professor Ripley and his colleagues note that prior to October 1977: "Key administrators of CETA wanted, above all, to insulate CIRALG from any controversy over manpower programs. This led them to defer to the council as a buffer against conflict."[5]

[1] William Mirengoff and Lester Rindler, *The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1976), pp. 52–53.
[2] Ibid., p. 55.
[3] Ibid., pp. 55–56.
[4] Randall B. Ripley, *The Implementation of CETA in Ohio* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1977), p. 10.
[5] Ohio State University, CETA Study, *Progress Report: CETA Prime Sponsor Management Decisions and Program Goal Achievement* (NP. Jan. 31, 1977), p. 86. (Hereafter cited as *Ohio State CETA Study.*)

In its assessment of CIRALG's CETA program conducted during the summer of 1977, the Department of Labor found that:

> The Prime Sponsor Planning Council [manpower area planning council] meets monthly and reviews all activity by Prime Sponsor [CIRALG]. In the past they exerted more than advisory influence but this is less of a problem now.[6]

The decreased influence probably refers to the fact that in FY 1977 MAPC participated heavily in preparing the CETA plan.[7] In 1978, however, the CIRALG plan was largely a staff product.[8]

CIRALG Board

The prime sponsor's decisionmaking authority ultimately rests in CIRALG's board. This is composed of 67 representatives of the local governments who are members. While the nominal members include the chief executive of the local governments, in fact these are sometimes represented by alternates. For example, Helen Barlow, the city clerk of Des Moines, normally represents Mayor Richard Olson. Voting in proportion to actual population can be required by any member. The city of Des Moines now has 48 percent of the total voting strength. In most votes, the CIRALG board decisions are made by majority of board members present. Each jurisdiction is allotted one seat for every 25,000 population or fraction thereof. The city of Des Moines, by resolution of the city council, has only three seats (one seat for 67,000 of population). Two-thirds of CIRALG board members must be elected officials.[9] There are no minorities on the CIRALG board because there are no minority chief executives or delegates. As a result, minorities have no direct representation in the final decisions on CETA programs when these are made by CIRALG. Although several jurisdictions have more than one representative on the CIRALG board, no minority person has ever been appointed to represent a member government.

City of Des Moines

While CIRALG has the nominal final authority regarding CETA planning, the city of Des Moines retains some rights. In describing the proposed consortium arrangement, City Manager Richard Wilkey told the Des Moines City Council in 1974 that:

> It is possible for the City of Des Moines to maintain control over plan development and implementation because the City could require that any plan first be submitted to the City of Des Moines as the only presumptive prime sponsor in the region and the CIRALG board could be required to approve the plan with the roll call option by which the City of Des Moines would have a majority vote.[10]

In FY 1978 the city had only 48 percent of the vote.

In a letter to the city manager, dated May 14, 1975, Terry Smith, then executive director of CIRALG, wrote that he was forwarding the FY 1976 plan for city approval before submitting it to his board because, "Final approval from both the City of Des Moines and CIRALG are necessary prior to plan submittal to the Department of Labor."[11] In the next year, the acting executive director of CIRALG wrote to the city manager that, "We are requesting council action on this plan prior to the June 20 Association meeting, so that the Association may also act on this plan."[12] Under the agreement the city will approve or recommend revisions in the plan. But each year the city council must certify that the existing consortium agreement remains unchanged.[13] This gives the city of Des Moines a potential option to veto CETA program decisions. The city's capacity to do so was recognized by Dennis Harney, the executive director of CIRALG. He announced that because of a city protest Greater Opportunities would not be considered as a potential subcontractor for FY 1977.[14]

[6] Raymond Moritz, memorandum for the annual assessment to Ray Lybarger [a DOL memorandum], July 11, 1977, p. 6.
[7] *Ohio State CETA Study*, p. 95.
[8] Dennis Harney, executive director of CIRALG, interview in Des Moines, May 19, 1977.
[9] Information from CIRALG bylaws; and, Archie Brooks, telephone interview, Dec. 13, 1977.
[10] Richard Wilkey, Des Moines city manager, to Des Moines City Council, letter no. 271 for agenda of Feb. 28, 1974, p. 2. See chapter 2 for an example of this in practice.
[11] J. Terry Smith, former CIRALG executive director, letter to Richard Wilkey, May 14, 1975.
[12] Gary Prior, letter to Richard Wilkey, June 16, 1976.
[13] Richard Wilkey to the Mayor and Council, letter no. 2409, agenda of May 16, 1977.
[14] "New Job Contract is Denied to GO," *Des Moines Tribune*, Aug. 26, 1976.

Minority and Female Staff Participation

At present a black male operations director directs the CIRALG division that operates CETA's daily activities. He is the only minority out of six senior managers. He reports to a white male director of human resources, who reports to a white male executive director. The heads of the management information system and public service employment units in the CETA operations unit are also white males. They report to the operations director. The affirmative action officer who deals with program clients is a black male. He reports to the director of human resources. The senior employability planner, who reports to the director of human resources, is a white male.

The highest ranking female in CIRALG is the comptroller. She reports to the executive director. Other high-ranking females are the senior aging planner and the employee relations officer. The latter reports to the executive director. There are minorities and women in the various middle-level positions in both EDS and planning. Minorities, male and female, are 21.1 percent of professional staff. Women are 42.1 percent of professional staff.[15] CIRALG states that minorities qualified for senior posts are hard to find. To alleviate this, CIRALG has hired minorities and women for entry-level roles using CETA public service employment funds. Many of these are expected to make the transition to permanent unsubsidized employment. Some may eventually rise to senior positions.[16]

The Des Moines City Council includes no minority member. The city manager and his professional staff of three are white males. The head of the city department of personnel, the head of the city civil service commission, and the deputy head of the city department of personnel are white males. Of 17 heads of departments in the city, 2 are black; 1 is a white female. Of nine assistant department heads, one is a black female and one an Asian American. Of 94 administrators in these departments, 6 (6.38 percent) are black (5 males, 1 female). Blacks hold 5.66 percent of professional and technical jobs.

There are 4 females out of 94 persons in administrative jobs with the city of Des Moines (4.26 percent of the total). Females hold 11.3 percent of the professional and technical level jobs.[17]

[15] Data from CIRALG organization chart and Jan. 1, 1978, survey of current employment.

[16] Dennis Harney, interview in Des Moines, May 19, 1977.

[17] Data supplied by the city of Des Moines.

9. Summary and Conclusions

The Advisory Committee sought to determine the extent to which the CETA program in greater Des Moines has helped redress economic discrimination against minorities and women. In Des Moines the CETA program has an eight-county jurisdiction. The Des Moines SMSA constitutes about 60 percent of the population. The prime sponsor is the Central Iowa Regional Association of Local Governments (CIRALG).

During FY 1977 the Title I training program offered eight training classes, six at its Bell Avenue facility and two at the Ankeny campus of Des Moines Area Community College. During FY 1978 only five classes were offered—four at the Ankeny campus and one in midtown Des Moines. For all these classes, admission was based, except in a few instances, on test scores There remains, however, the questionable assumption that academic accomplishment is a necessary prerequisite for skills training. The tests used to measure accomplishment may not predict success in training.

Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians comprised nearly 17.8 percent of those in the Title I training program, according to CIRALG's fourth quarterly report for FY 1977. But another CIRALG study shows these minorities were only 7.8 percent of vocational trainees during February to June 1977. Moreover, during FY 1977 minorities were concentrated in two of the eight classes.

In addition to classroom training, the program offered on-the-job training. During FY 1977 only about two-thirds of the placements planned were used.

During FY 1977 there was no work experience opportunity. This could have provided transitional funding for clients while they waited for processing and provided some introduction to employment.

In FY 1977, 38.9 percent of those who left the program were placed in jobs following the completion of training. This was higher than the national but lower than the regional average. Of those leaving, 45 percent did so prior to completion of training without finding employment.

The application process was discouraging. To reach the intake center during FY 1977, applicants had to take one of eight buses that ran daily, the last of which left the black community at 9:25 a.m. They were then stranded at the intake center until nearly 2:45 p.m., when bus service back to the central city began. Although theroretically the process of application could be completed in 3 days, it frequently lasted anywhere from 2 weeks to 2 months for the applicant with average priority. Minorities were more likely than others to drop out during this process. Some minority persons believed that the testing required was a means to discourage their entry. Less than one-third of all applicants completed all the steps required for entry.

Many potential clients never heard of the CETA program. Only minimal efforts to reach minorities were made during FY 1977. During FY 1978 four recruitment and intake centers were established, one in the black community. But as of October 1977 no applicants were sought because the program was still handling applicants admitted earlier.

In addition to training programs, the CETA program funded public service employment (PSE) positions with local governments and nonprofit agencies. Although minority-run, nonprofit agencies were the most likely to hire minority professionals and paraprofessionals, only in April 1977, following a conciliation agreement between CIRALG and six minority community leaders, did a substantial number of PSE positions become available to minority groups. The U.S. Department of Labor has issued regulations to require increased use of nonprofit agencies.

Although the city claimed it satisfied Department of Labor requirements not to use CETA funds to fill positions it could fund, the city maintained no records that explicitly document "maintenance of effort." The data that were presented to the

Advisory Committee could be interpreted to show that "maintenance of effort" requirements had not been satisfied.

Transition from federally-funded to local-funded positions is a goal of the PSE program. The Department of Labor suggests a goal of about 50 percent of all terminations for Title II. In the city of Des Moines, the transition rate for both Titles II and VI was about 38 percent. Minorities, especially minority males, in laborer and equivalent jobs and in semiprofessional or professional jobs were less likely to make the transition than their white counterparts.

The chairperson of the manpower area planning council denies that the Title I program applicants were "creamed." But he did agree that some persons "who would not have been employable" were excluded. Of those enrolled in Title I, 22.4 percent had previously held jobs paying more than $4.00 per hour. Far greater proportions of those enrolled in Titles II and VI had received high wages.

The Department of Labor acknowledged that its desire for a 5 to 10 percent increase in the placement rate might make it more difficult for a program to accept the economically disadvantaged. But the Department also contended that the prime sponsor, not the Department, set the placement rate and that no prime sponsor had ever been denied refunding because its placement rate was too low. While the regulations specify that the disadvantaged be served, along with the underemployed and unemployed, these comprise only one of several categories entitled to service, although the President had indicated that the disadvantaged should have priority.

In the Title I program the rejection of applicants is formally the responsibility of the intake and assessment subcontractors. These are required to ensure that 65 percent of those they admit will finish training and be placed in jobs. But during FY 1977 they successfully placed only 30.6 percent of those leaving the program after training. Similar limits were placed on the numbers expected to drop out during training. CIRALG demanded a "nonpositive termination rate" for persons leaving before the end of training (but not employed) of 35 percent or less. In FY 1977 the nonpositive termination rate was 44.8 percent. For FY 1978, CIRALG required a positive termination rate of 65 percent.

In FY 1977 the classroom training subcontractor believed that about 65 percent of those entering the program completed training; for FY 1978 the contractor was required to ensure that 80 percent of those entering the program completed training.

Under the act, many ancillary services can be provided to CETA enrollees. CIRALG did not provide some of the services permitted. Counseling services of an undetermined quality were available for Title I clients, but not for public service workers. Adult basic education training was provided only occasionally in FY 1977, although this would be necessary to bring applicants with substandard educational accomplishments up to the minimum required for classroom training. In FY 1978 adult basic education is provided, but the stipend to participants need not be as high as that for vocational class participants. Bus transportation was difficult in FY 1977 to Bell Avenue and nonexistent in FY 1978 for the Ankeny campus of DMACC. CIRALG reported car pools had proved an effective alternative.

Minorities were not effectively represented on the manpower area planning council until April 1977. By the time minorities attained representation, the council's influence began to wane.

There were no minority members on the CIRALG board, although the board held ultimate power over the CETA program. One out of six of the top staff at CIRALG is a minority person.

CIRALG's power was limited by the influence of the city of Des Moines. As sole "presumptive prime sponsor," the city could effectively end the consortium by withdrawal. In the past the city could require a roll-call vote based on population, which would give the city an absolute majority over all other members. This is no longer the case. The city now has 48 percent of the vote. Although the city does not possess a formal right of veto over the CETA plan, its effective veto right was conceded by CIRALG's executive director on the one occasion when the city council objected to part of the proposed plan. There are no minorities on the city council or in the city manager's office. About 6 percent of the senior staff of the city are minorities; about 12 percent are female.

The findings and recommendations reflect the Advisory Committee's special concern for the interests of minorities and women. Numerically, these two groups rank disproportionately high among those most in need of government assistance and therefore should be the primary focus of CETA.

10. Findings and Recommendations

Finding 1: Although CIRALG holds data on its target population, most of that is derived from census and Iowa Job Service figures. Past reports of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and others have indicated that such data generally undercount minorities and fail to reveal the full extent of their problems. There are also gaps in information on applicants and participants, despite efforts by CIRALG to improve its information structure.

Recommendation 1a: The Department of Labor should provide funds to CIRALG so that it can assemble its own data base on target populations.

Recommendation 1b: CIRALG should undertake special studies that will identify more precisely the extent of minority needs, both in areas of minority concentration and in nonurban areas served by CIRALG.

Recommendation 1c: CIRALG should expand its management information system to include a capability of tracking the progress of individual applicants and the flows of the different ethnic groups.

Finding 2: The CIRALG program and CETA are not designed to train persons who have little formal education.

Recommendation 2: CIRALG should review and make appropriate modifications to its vocational education component to offer more effective training for those lacking formal education. It should make greater use of modern training techniques (e.g., audiovisual equipment).

Finding 3: CIRALG provided in-class training in eight subjects during FY 1977 and five during FY 1978. During FY 1977 minorities were underrepresented in six of the eight training programs.

Recommendation 3: CIRALG should monitor on a regular basis enrollments in the classroom training to ensure that there is no discrimination in assignment of students. It should take appropriate measures to correct any discrimination that is discovered.

Finding 4: On-the-job training provides employer-directed training paid for in part by Federal funds. During FY 1977, because of limited employment opportunities, only 77.2 percent of those planned to be enrolled were enrolled. CIRALG was aware of this deficiency and made successful efforts to remedy it. Businesses have not been very interested in OJT.

Recommendation 4: CIRALG should improve the OJT program through greater employer participation. It should provide detailed analyses for employers regarding future placement needs and kinds of trainees who could fill these needs. The chamber of commerce should become more actively involved with the entire CETA program. CIRALG board members should solicit this support personally among local business leaders.

Finding 5: The application process during FY 1977 generally took from 2 weeks to 2 months per applicant.

Recommendation 5: CIRALG should require that the typical admissions process be completed in 1 week.

Finding 6: CIRALG did discontinue use of the California test in April 1977, following a determination that it was invalid. Tests now used may not be appropriate counseling tools to predict performance and in some cases may have had the effect of discouraging minority applicants.

Recommendation 6: Testing should not be used to control entry into the program until tests are developed that can appropriately predict the student's receptivity to training, irrespective of race, sex, or socioeconomic status.

Finding 7: CIRALG took few measures to attract minorities to the Title I program. In FY 1978 it instituted a recruitment program by establishing outreach offices in minority and poverty neighborhoods.

Recommendation 7: CIRALG should increase dissemination of CETA information to minority and women's groups through direct contact with minority and women's community organizations, minority

and women's media, and spot radio and TV announcements directed toward minority and female listeners.

Finding 8: Until a substantial number of PSE jobs were offered to the minority-run, nonprofit agencies in April 1977, public service employment programs had utilized primarily white participants and agencies.

Recommendation 8: CIRALG should require that priority be given to economically disadvantaged applicants. One method might be to increase the share of jobs given to minority-administered, nonprofit agencies. PSE can serve as a talent bank for minority and female professionals.

Finding 9: Transition opportunities for participants in both the Title II and Title VI PSE programs have been less than the goal of 50 percent for Title II. The Department of Labor sets no goal for Title VI.

Recommendation 9: CIRALG should encourage an increase in the proportion of persons transitioned and require that minorities and women be transitioned to the same degree as white males. However, PSE standards should not be based exclusively on the likelihood of transition to unsubsidized employment—access for the hard-core unemployed and their transition should also be factors.

Finding 10: During FY 1977, CIRALG did not make a maximum effort to place in its Title I training program those applicants in greatest need of training. This has been encouraged at least implicitly by the U.S. Department of Labor's expectations for positive terminations. PSE jobs were given to the more highly qualified applicants.

Recommendation 10a: CIRALG should choose applicants who are most disadvantaged. It should be further refined to ensure that it gives greatest weight to the needs of the hard-core unemployed.

Recommendation 10b: CIRALG should modify its Title I training performance standards so that not only client placement but also service to the economically disadvantaged is accorded priority.

Recommendation 10c: The Department of Labor should modify its instructions to prime sponsors and to Federal representatives to ensure that they do not set standards that encourage or require "creaming."

Finding 11: Persons who need CETA programs frequently also need extensive support services such as day care and health care, which are provided only on a case-by-case rather than an automatic basis by CIRALG. General provision of such services is allowed by the CETA regulations.

Recommendation 11: Counseling should become a more valued component of the services provided. CIRALG should review its present counseling program to ensure that participants are getting sufficient support services so that those most in need can complete training and find employment.

Finding 12: Because there are no minorities and few women as appointed representatives to the CIRALG association, these groups have had minimal involvement in ultimate decisions about CETA.

Recommendation 12: The local governments should take measures to provide minority and female representations in their appointments to the CIRALG association.

Appendix A

CETA Program Characteristics, Federal Region VII

	Classroom	Counseling	Health	Day care	Cash	OJT	Adult WE
Nebraska balance of State	Various slot-in	yes	no	no	no	yes	yes
Lincoln	Auto mech. Welding Machine trades Health services Basic ed./GED Clerical	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes
Omaha	Welding Office occup. Electrical Carpenter Slot-in Basic education Drafting Keypunch Merchandising	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
Missouri balance of State	Health classes Everything slot-in	no	no	no	no	yes	yes
Independence	Clerical GED	no	yes	no	no	yes	no
Hillsboro	LPN Welding Paramedic Heating/AC GED ABE	no	yes	no	no	yes	no
St. Louis County	Machine shop Nurse & orderly Rest voc. ed.	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes
Kansas City, Mo., Area Consortium	Construction Building maint. Health occup. Clerical Welding Basic education	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
St. Charles	Basic education Building maint. Clerical Medical asst.	no	no	no	no	yes	no
St. Louis	Auto body Building maint. Business ed. Machine shop Sheet metal Welding Basic ed.	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes
Springfield	Slot-in	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
Independence	Slot-in	yes	no	no	yes	yes	no
Kansas balance of State	Welding LPN Secretarial Other slot-in GED	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes

	Classroom	Counseling	Health	Day care	Cash	OJT	Adult WE
Kansas City, Kans.—Wyandotte	Slot-in Clerical Bookkeeping Banking/insurance LPN GED	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no
Johnson—Leavenworth	Clerical Landscaping Law enforcement Environmental engineer Health Slot-in, incl. basic ed.	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes
Wichita	LPN Health training Office occupations Welding Machine operations Sheet metal Electronics Basic ed./GED	no	no	no	no	yes	no
Topeka	Receptionist—clerk-typist Secretarial Bookkeeping Accounting clerk General office GED Slot-in for health careers	yes	no	no	no	yes	yes
Iowa-balance of State	Various—varies by region GED Basic ed./GED	yes	no	y	no	no	no
Black Hawk	Slot-in GED/basic ed.	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no
Woodbury	Slot-in	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes
Linn	Slot-in	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes
Davenport	LPN, other med. Clerical Computer operator Maint./mechanic Truck driver Heating & cooling	yes	no	no	no	yes	yes
Central Iowa	Auto service Auto body repair Upholstery Welding Machine shop Building maintenance Business occupations Copy reproduction Slot-in	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no

Source: Region VII, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

Appendix B

Calculation of Adult Educational Competence

Data on adult competence are difficult to obtain. Only national and regional studies have been done. One such study is the University of Texas' *Adult Functional Competency Study* of March 1975. This found that in the Nation as a whole 19.7 percent of the adult population was functioning with difficulty, 33.9 percent could function, and 46.3 percent could function with proficiency. Of the adults, 32.9 percent had difficulty with computation, 28.0 percent had difficulty with problem solving, and 21.7 percent had difficulty with reading.

The study also measured competence by the educational level of respondents. For those who have completed 8–11 years of education, the study found 18 percent were having difficulty in functioning, while for high school graduates, 11 percent were found to have difficulty in functioning.[1] Projected onto the Des Moines scene, based on CIRALG's data on the years of schooling completed by the program area population, only about 86 percent of the population could meet the competency requirements of CIRALG. Data are not presented by CIRALG for the incomes of the area population. But since all clients for Title I have an income around $5,000, a full 40 percent of the population may be in functional difficulty,[2] unlikely to meet program minimum proficiency requirements. The Education Commission of the States reports that, nationwide, black young adults score below the national level while whites score considerably above.[3]

There are no direct data on adult educational competence in Des Moines. What are available are data on the capability of students in 11th grade of the Des Moines public schools measured by tests administered in fall 1976. In the district as a whole, 16 percent of the student body was below the 16th percentile on national norms. This meant they were achieving at eighth grade or less. But in the two schools with substantial black enrollments, 23 percent (at North High School) and 32 percent (at Tech High School) were at the eighth grade level. Twenty-six percent of the student body are functioning with the competence of a ninth grader—25th percentile in grade 11 tests. Assuming a slight loss in capability as school experiences fade and skills go unused, many of these would not be acceptable to CIRALG. As many as 34.2 percent (at North) and 47.2 percent (at Tech) of students in schools with substantial black enrollments may not be able to meet the minimum standards set by the community college for admission into a training program.[4]

[1] Norvell Northcutt and others, "Adult Functional Competency: A Summary" (Austin, Tex.: Univ. of Texas, 1975), pp. 5–7.

[2] Ibid.

[3] National Assessment of Education Progress, *Reading: Summary Data* (Education Commission of the States: July 1974), p. 19.

[4] Data on test results from: Des Moines Independent Community School District, Dept. of Guidance, Counseling and Testing, *Report of Iowa Tests of Educational Development* (Fall 1976). (Supplied to Central States Regional Office on Dec. 16, 1977.) Data on conversion from national percentile norm to grade equivalent contained in Univ. of Iowa, *Norms Published by the Fall Testing Program* (Iowa City: 1977).

Glossary

ADASI (formerly called ADAPT): Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services, Inc. (outreach, intake, assessment subcontractor).

CETA: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act.

CIRALG: Central Iowa Regional Association of Local Governments.

Class-size training: Classes provided exclusively for CETA participants.

Creaming: The practice of selecting only those clients with the highest potential for completion of training and the easiest to place following training.

DOL (USDOL): U.S. Department of Labor.

DMACC: Des Moines Area Community College.

ETA: Employment and Training Administration of DOL.

Greater Opportunities, Inc.: Formerly conducted the community action program for the Des Moines area, as well as employment and training services.

Indirect Placement: An indirect placement occurs if the client is placed in unsubsidized employment after participating in CETA-funded training, employment, or supportive services.

Iowa Comprehensive Manpower Services: Outreach, intake, assessment subcontractor.

Job Service of Iowa: Employment service unit of Iowa Department of Job Service, formerly an outreach, intake, assessment subcontractor.

MAPCCI: Manpower Area Planning Council of Central Iowa. The required citizen advisory committee planning council for the local CETA program.

Nonpositive Termination: A nonpositive termination occurs from the CETA program when a participant is laid off, leaves for health-pregnancy reasons, family care, transportation problems, moves from the area, refuses to continue, administrative separation, cannot be located, other.

OJT: On-the-job training program, a component of the Title I CETA program.

Prime Sponsor: Shall mean a unit of government, combinations of units of government, or a rural concentrated employment program grantee, which has entered into a grant with the Department of Labor to provide comprehensive manpower services under Title I of the act.

PSE: Public Service Employment (a component of CETA funded under Titles II, VI).

Slot-in Training: Placement of CETA clients in a training program open to all.

Title I: Establishes a program to provide comprehensive manpower services throughout the Nation, including the development and creation of job opportunities and the training, education, and other services needed to enable individuals to secure and retain employment at their maximum capacity.

Titles II and VI: Primarily for public service employment.

Transition: The movement of PSE employees from federally-funded jobs to jobs funded by local government or private sources.

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1978-723-618/423-31